White Paper

The Next Generation PhD Planning Grant White Paper
The Living Humanities PhD for the 21ˢᵗ Century

Eva Badowska, co-PI
Matthew McGowan, co-PI
Melissa Labonte
Samantha Sabalis

Table of Contents

The "Living Humanities" PhD for the 21st Century

What Happened?

      The "Living Humanities" PhD project convened for seven three-hour meetings between September 2016 and May 2017 (Appendix 1). Each meeting was open to members of both the Core Planning and Constituent Advisory Groups of the project, and of the thirty-four active members, approximately twenty attended each meeting (Appendix 2). In advance of each session, the Co-Principal Investigators, Eva Badowska and Matthew McGowan, disseminated detailed preparatory agendas, key questions, and readings (Appendices 3 and 4).

      Throughout the project, communication took multiple forms to keep as broad a community as possible informed of our work. For example, following each meeting, the project's graduate assistant, Samantha Sabalis, shared detailed minutes (Appendix 5), which were posted on the project website. Key themes were featured in a blog post and published on the Fordham GSAS Outlook Blog (Appendix 6). Dr. Badowska also provided updates on the project to the members of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS) Council, which is constituted by department chairs and directors for all GSAS programs, including the five PhD-granting departments in the humanities. Dr. Badowska gave a presentation on the progress of the work on December 8, 2016 at the CGS annual meeting in Washington, DC; and, Drs. Badowska and McGowan disseminated information about the project in January 2017 sessions in Washington, DC organized by the NEH and the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS).

      The project's inaugural meeting on 14 October 2016 began with an overview of the challenges facing doctoral education in the humanities, presented by Leonard Cassuto, Professor of English and American Studies at Fordham University and author of *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It*, and Core Planning Group member. After Cassuto's talk, participants used the World Café method to discuss five key question areas for revitalizing doctoral education: 1/ the goals of doctoral education; 2/ the skills that it develops; 3/ its teaching mission and pedagogy; 4/ how to connect what is taught with career outcomes; and 5/ how to make the PhD more public-facing.

      The second meeting, held on 15 November 2016, focused on the planning theme of "Ensure Access and Inclusion." For this session, participants read selections from Julie Posselt's *Inside Graduate Admissions: Merit, Diversity, and Faculty Gatekeeping* and were divided into two discussion groups: 1/ Recruitment, Application and Admissions; and 2/ Retention, Mentoring, and Student Support. The working groups presented a slate of specific recommendations to design better practices that integrally support access and inclusion from A (the admission funnel) to Z (graduation, placement, and alumni support).

      The third meeting, which occurred on 30 November 2016, engaged the planning theme "Revitalize Learning Outcomes." It featured Sidonie Smith, Mary Fair Croushore Professor of the Humanities and Director of the Institute for the Humanities at the University of Michigan. Following a talk based on her recent book, *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times*, Smith facilitated a workshop for participants to brainstorm, in broad strokes, what a new model for doctoral education might entail. Smith called on participants to re-imagine the purpose and function of the PhD degree, and what skills should be developed as part of the degree. While participants upheld the view that a doctoral degree in the humanities is a professional credential for future scholars, they also affirmed that it cannot be thought of as serving exclusively that goal, and put

forward new models that included required internships, transferrable skills development, and individual study plans.

The fourth meeting, held on 18 January 2017, focused on the planning theme of "Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem" and was led by Steve D'Agustino, Director of Online Learning at Fordham University and Core Planning Group member. The meeting was based on a series of seven quotations, extrapolated from the assigned readings for this session, on teaching and learning in higher education and the development of new learning ecosystems. While the groups debated the issues raised by the quotations, they focused on how we in academia can "unlearn" the traditional assumptions about career outcomes, doctoral pedagogy, and goals. There was a particular focus on communication, which acts as a fulcrum, allowing us to engage doctoral students in speaking to different publics.

The fifth meeting, which occurred on 22 February 2017, focused on the planning theme of "Mentor the Whole Person: Career-Wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships" and featured Jason Pedicone, President of the Paideia Institute for Humanistic Study. Pedicone described the development and results of the Legion Project, an initiative designed to create and sustain an online community of former graduate students in Classics by tracking their career pathways over time, and providing a forum for those who have sought careers outside academia to share experiences and insights with one another. Project participants brainstormed about the various ways Fordham could develop its own networks of alumni and industry partners to help doctoral graduates forge industry contacts and find employment opportunities beyond the professoriate. This session also included individual presentations prepared by participants from Classics, English, History, Philosophy, and Theology that centered on how each program undertakes mentoring, including the goals underpinning their efforts and the resources they utilize to achieve those goals.

The sixth meeting, held on 29 March 2017, focused on the planning theme of "Incorporate Service and Community Engagement" and featured Matthew Jacobson, William Robertson Coe Professor of American Studies and History and founder of the Public Humanities Institute at Yale University. In his remarks to the group, Jacobson charted his experiences creating the Institute, examined how student and faculty produced works of public scholarship, and discussed how the Institute engages a variety of communities and institutions in New Haven. The group arrived at a preliminary consensus that the public humanities model offers a valuable alternative for doctoral education in the humanities in general.

In preparation for the last planning theme, "Cultivate and Curate a Living Humanities PhD Model," participants were divided into six groups of five, each centered on a key theme that carried across the discussions at the previous project meetings: 1/ Holistic Career Preparation; 2/ Internal Coordination for External Partnerships; 3/ Holistic Mentoring; 4/ Digital Learning as Method and Object/Collaboration; 5/ Public Scholarship; and 6/ Admissions (Recruitment, Application, and Retention). Each group worked independently for a month to distill the key conclusions about its assigned theme and develop three concrete recommendations for how the theme should be integrated into the new doctoral model. In addition, each group was asked to tackle the issue of how their group would adapt the dissertation and foster interdisciplinary scholarship through the reshaping of this capstone goal of doctoral education. The groups each created a short report (see Appendix 7) and presented their findings at the final project meeting, held on 17 May 2017, before discussing next steps for drafting the White Paper.

Finally, on 19 June 2017, project participants gathered for a three-hour White Paper Drafting Boot Camp, which contributed significantly to focusing the elements of this report. Plans are currently under way to organize a campus-wide workshop in September 2017 to seed the ideas presented in this White Paper within and across the entire Arts and Sciences graduate community at Fordham.

What Worked and What Didn't?

There was much that worked well throughout the project, although sometimes in an unanticipated manner. In addition to reviewing our meeting minutes and reflecting on this question, the co-P.I.s administered a brief, two-question survey to all project participants asking for open-ended feedback on what worked and what didn't in relation to this project.

Starting with "what worked," three main accomplishments stand out. First, and in short, the project planted the seeds for genuine community-building among the faculty as well as project participants external to Fordham. This was borne out in the survey responses, with a majority of the eleven respondents commenting positively on this as a notable element that "worked." Participants concurred that the project aided tremendously in breaking down intellectual silos across Fordham's humanities programs and inspired a renewed commitment to reimagining humanities doctoral education through the year-long engagement as well as the sharing of perspectives and insights. Given the contemporary environment where the devaluing of the humanities is more commonplace than ever, and in which discourse itself seems bereft of cooperative spirit and remains marked by antagonisms, this project has catalyzed a new community of committed advocates across all of Fordham's five PhD-granting humanities departments.

Second, and as we had hoped, our original planning themes proved to be an effective mechanism to segment the current landscape of thinking and research on doctoral education in the humanities. However, an unanticipated benefit was that the themes precipitated new paths of engagement and forged a set of cross-cutting themes that turned out to be pivotal in our progress. The process of ideational exploration and the nascent community-building described above converged with the planning themes in ways we had not planned, but which will help yield a durable, scalable model for the Next Generation Humanities PhD at Fordham going forward. For example, the role of public scholarship formed part of a broader dialogue that served as the focal point for the planning theme session dedicated to "Incorporate Service and Community Engagement." Yet it also emerged spontaneously at two earlier sessions: "Ensure Access and Inclusion" and "Revitalize Learning Outcomes." As we approached the final stages of the project via smaller working groups, each group was assigned one of these cross-cutting elements and tasked with proposing recommendations for a new humanities doctoral model within that theme. The resulting model retains segments of the original planning themes, but also reflects elements of this organic and catalytic process that emerged through the planning sessions and small group work.

Third, our approach to the project aided greatly in making many of its participants more collaborative planners for a future implementation phase. In addition to the silo-effect of the departmental organization of humanities disciplines in academia, the ebb and flow of the academic year cycle has tended to impede departments and programs from breaking out of routines and from imagining what new processes and structures may be possible. Indeed, the new humanities PhD model we are now envisioning reflects innovative planning informed not simply by adding new elements to an existing model, but by deconstructing major components of the model, reconfiguring some, jettisoning others, and capturing new capacities, strengths, interactions, and synergies between and within departments.

The resulting approach to planning included a more open phase, where all ideas were welcome and dialogue was as inclusive as possible. This was followed by a more focused phase, which formed the latter part of the project planning process. During this phase, participants were asked to grapple with the real constraints that exist at Fordham, and to find ways around them while also building up all aspects of the new model in a methodical manner. This phase benefited greatly from information sharing across programs and participants concerning best practices, pilot projects being undertaken at the department level, lessons learned through failed initiatives, and the insights of external community stakeholders. Together, the interactive effects of this planning process have positioned us well to ensure that the model we propose is scalable and that it can be continuously monitored and evaluated with an eye toward revision and improvement.

While there are a number of issues we wish we had known prior to commencing this project, none represented the type of obstacle that would impair our ability to advance the planning themes or the overall project goals. The obstacles that emerged required flexibility and adaptation to ensure the project was kept on track and that participants were continuously engaged in the planning process.

First, we did not formulate in advance an assessment plan to gauge the effectiveness of our methods of communicating internally to faculty and students regarding the project's progress. The main vehicles for disseminating information about the project included a regularly-updated website and blog; Dean's updates on the project at monthly GSAS Council meetings to department chairs and program directors; and pre- and post- meeting social media outreach to the broader Fordham/GSAS community. While these efforts certainly helped raise awareness of the project and encouraged feedback, their longer-term effects were difficult to ascertain. Relatedly, while eight participants in the project were doctoral degree holders working in non-faculty positions, we could have sought out additional representation in this area to expand this stakeholder group.

Second, participants noted two areas of shortfall in our discussions that were reflected in both the survey and the White Paper drafting boot camp session held on 19 June: we failed to ground discussions of diversity and inclusion in a broader context (e.g. campus-related developments and regional/national developments); and we did not integrate fully the global context that is likely to affect how we perceive and conceive a new humanities PhD model that extends well beyond the local Fordham community.

Third, the logistics of scheduling meetings emerged as a minor but meaningful constraint. Numbering twenty, our project's Core Planning Group members were not located on one campus (Fordham has two main campuses, one in Manhattan and one in the Bronx). For all meetings, however, we were able, with the help of Doodle, to identify a common three-hour block meeting time during which a majority of members could attend. Occasionally we reverted to videoconferencing for our colleagues whose work at the Lincoln Center campus impeded their participation at Rose Hill. Some colleagues suggested that scheduling meetings during the working hours made participation difficult for those members of the Constituent Advisory Group who work outside of academia.

Fourth, except for a modest subset, participation by some members of the Constituent Advisory Group, which also numbered twenty, remained uneven throughout the project. In advance of planning theme sessions, we attempted to ensure the participation of select individuals from this group whose professional expertise paralleled a planned meeting focus. The results were mixed, and some members of this group were unable to participate in more than one or two meetings throughout the project. To remedy this, the Co-PIs and project staff decided to move away from the original plan of involving Constituent Advisory Group members selectively and, instead, to integrate those whose schedules permitted fuller participation into every planning meeting. This had an unanticipated, positive benefit

for the Core Advisory Group members, who were subsequently able to engage more deeply and regularly with these external and community-based stakeholders. The resulting discussions that ensued retained their focus while also benefitting from a wider range of perspectives and insights.

What Does It All Mean?

In a recent webinar in the Next Generation PhD Consortium series with CGS, colleagues referred to the network of relationships developed by grantees as "the NextGen universe." The phrase, though used informally and in passing, aptly captured two aspects of what has emerged here at Fordham GSAS over the course of the year: 1/ the creation of a networked community of engagement (a "social sphere") as a key outcome of the process; and 2/ the emergence of a "thick" and layered conceptual framework that does not belie the complex interrelatedness of the components of any new model for the Next Generation Humanities PhD.

As described above in the "What Worked" section, within the first few months of intense discussions it became apparent to us that an essential outcome of the planning grant will consist not so much in the development of the present White Paper or even the preparation of a set of proposed implementations for a specific pilot. Rather it will manifest in the creation, cultivation, and growth of a vibrant community of change makers, idea ambassadors, thought leaders, and seed bearers, who will carry the process forward within and outside of Fordham. This was made possible by the large scope of internal and external engagement we staged for the grant process, choosing to involve all five of Fordham GSAS humanities doctoral departments (Classics, English, History, Philosophy, and Theology) as well as external stakeholders, instead of focusing our planning process from the get-go on a specific, department- or discipline-based, planning project. While this meant that we were, admittedly, dealing with a disparate group of interests and thus slower to move from the more general conceptual plane to a solution-focused and process-oriented mode, we succeeded in creating a cross-disciplinary community of exchange and support that counteracted departmental and disciplinary silos. Indeed, we drew new inspirations from this interdisciplinary breadth.

In retrospect, this strikes us a vital strength of our planning agenda as well as its most significant outcome. We began from the premise that any model for the Next Generation Humanities PhD must interact with the multitude of vectors comprising the humanities today: its many disciplines and its academic as well as non-academic realizations. But we also began from the premise of theoretical and intellectual breadth, electing to anchor our group around a set of common readings that sustain contemporary discussions of reform in graduate education in the humanities. Our large and varied group thus began to establish both horizontal links from discipline to discipline and from inside Fordham to our various partner communities (local, professional, and other), as well as vertical links that converged around a set of common discursive reference points and a set of common arguments and data sets.

Much of the animus undoubtedly derived from the shared purpose to work together to counteract the devaluation of the humanities on the national stage and in political discourse today. The group also shared a commitment to helping resolve the related crisis of academic employment for graduates of PhD programs in these disciplines. Ultimately, what matters is that the Next Generation Humanities PhD has become for us at Fordham *not (just) a project but an intellectual movement*. In other terms, the Next Generation PhD grant acquired for us a *performative* meaning: we discovered that change in doctoral education in the humanities to a large degree may depend on creating and sustaining a group of invested change makers who function, in fact, as community organizers.

In addition, not only did the large interdepartmental and stakeholder group invest itself in a shared change movement, but it also became a forum for exchanging expertise and experience. For example, representatives from different departments shared best practices for professional development for graduate students and distinctive, departmentally-driven frameworks for mentoring. In addition, because the group included a significant number of PhDs employed in what could be called compatible or alternative career tracks (eight in all), we had access to authentic voices on behalf of the humanities outside of academia, and on behalf of a broader conception of the usefulness of the degree.

Our planning effort took, from the start, a *gestalt* view of the problem by proposing a set of six planning themes encompassing the various dimensions of doctoral education in the humanities. We brought to the project a conviction that a change to one aspect of what constitutes either the process or the outcome of a doctoral degree will necessitate the rethinking of the entire structural and social "universe" of doctoral education. In the process of discussing and workshopping, the six planning themes were gradually distilled into a set of *cross-cutting elements*, which more closely represented the complex interconnectedness of the issues and the gestalt view of the whole, and which also tracked more accurately the interests of the departments and the existing strengths of Fordham GSAS and its stakeholders. They are:

1/ Holistic career preparation
2/ Responsible and responsive mentoring
3/ Reliance on external partnerships
4/ Preparation for public scholarship
5/ Grounding in digital scholarship, pedagogy, and technology
6/ Emphasis on diversity and inclusion throughout

From these six elements and further discussions within our new-found community, we have curated a new model for the Next Generation Humanities PhD at Fordham that aims for genuine transformation from the ground up and tries to avoid merely tweaking around the edges or adding more bloat. We were also conscious of the need to balance what students need with time to degree, and made sure that at all stages we were building constitute a *transformative* (rather than an additive) model of humanities doctoral education. While individual humanities doctoral programs will need to devise department-specific measures for restructuring, there are at least three key elements that can be shared by all and that can be coordinated centrally by GSAS: 1/ holistic career preparation; 2/ responsible mentoring; and 3/ a unifying learning experience for all doctoral students.

From our "Initial Project Meeting," attended by nearly all project members and featuring Dr. Leonard Cassuto on *The Graduate School Mess*, it has been clear that holistic career preparation and responsible and responsive mentoring are intimately connected, largely interdependent, and that both could benefit from a unifying, student-centered learning experience that cuts across disciplines and brings together all doctoral candidates. All three could contribute feasibly to students' success in finishing the degree and identifying and securing a meaningful career path thereafter. In combination, they also have the capacity to increase "student happiness," to paraphrase Cassuto's nomenclature, and foster a more general sense of well-being in graduate school itself. These are perhaps underappreciated considerations for transforming doctoral education, but are stressed by Cassuto in his book and were found by project participants to be crucial to the "Living Humanities" project at Fordham.

Holistic career preparation can and surely should take many forms over the course of a graduate career, but participants agreed they would like to see it start early on in the process of one's doctoral studies and be continuous throughout the graduate school experience. For example, early on and during pre-admission recruitment efforts, departments will be encouraged to share with potential PhD

candidates a set of realistic expectations about the demands of the doctoral program, average time-to-degree, and prospects for post-doctoral employment. More open communication at this juncture could help to ease the transition to doctoral-level work, at the very beginning of which students ought to be introduced to the diverse career options for humanities PhDs. An obvious avenue for this is through alumni networking and non-academic job showcasing, for example, in a workshop or creatively planned proseminar. Ultimately, it is crucial that the next generation's PhD candidates in the humanities become aware of the wide range of employment paths available to them upon attaining their degree.

By the same token, over the course of their graduate careers students should be given opportunities to develop hard skills that are readily transferable beyond the academy. These opportunities could come from internships with external partners in the nonprofit sector, government, or even private industry. Through these internships, students would have the chance to carry out collaborative work in a non-academic setting, perhaps on publicly engaged projects, where they would have to adapt to a new environment, address different audiences, and begin to build bridges between the community and the academy.

This does not imply that the goal of graduate education should center on employment outside of the academy or that humanistic study should abandon its quest for wisdom in pursuit of some yet to be determined set of transferable skills. Rather, it recognizes the challenges of the world we live in, where academic jobs in the humanities are growing ever scarce. And it holds as axiomatic that having more people deeply trained in the humanities is good for society and the world's workforce. The key here is not to add distraction and overwhelm the course of study, but to offer a diverse set of experiences that sets students up for greater career diversity.

Expanding career diversity among humanities PhDs will necessitate greater acceptance and generosity from mentors, who can, through the practice of responsible and responsive mentoring, learn to be open to and supportive of the idea of careers outside of the academy and new kinds of goals for new kinds of students. Project participants viewed this as one of the primary cultural shifts that will have to take place in the next generation. Within Fordham, we will need to work hard to replace sclerotic notions of mentorship with more nimble and diverse models that stress the collaborative process and mutuality of expectations between mentor and mentee.

As in the case of diverse career preparation, truly responsible and responsive mentoring ought to begin during the recruiting phase, not least because it would demonstrate buy-in on the part of the professoriate, whose role in recruitment, admissions, and retention is crucial to any successful doctoral program. At this early stage, we would expect mentoring to be collaborative and fluid, and more generally reflective of an ethos of caretaking that nurtures graduate students and keeps them informed of their progress and prospects.

For the naturally more intensive mentorship associated with a capstone project or doctoral dissertation, we suggest providing guidelines at both the GSAS and departmental level, perhaps two pages for both mentor and mentee that outline best practices for a successful and sustainable outcome. This would help impede the inherent bias that exists within academia to reproduce past experiences of faculty themselves, and would avoid a fixation on the mentor/mentee dyad during the dissertation. Instead, the new model would feature more peer-to-peer mentoring and perhaps even relationships with mentors outside the academy, for whom we would like to make room in the next generation's more flexible humanities PhD program, where external partners would potentially become common contributors to the process.

Given that we operate at Fordham on a comparatively small scale with only five humanities PhD programs, participants suggested in various contexts over the course of the project that a shared learning experience for graduate students across departments be established. The goal would be to help break down silos between faculty and students, to work with and learn from one another, and to enhance to the overall quality of our programs.

We debated as a whole and in smaller groups what form such an experience should take: 1/ an intensive workshop as part of orientation with a follow-up meeting or meetings during the year; 2/ a yearlong seminar for credit run by faculty from different departments; or 3/ a two-day conference at the start of every term where professors and students share their work. There was also some debate about what the content should be: 1/ a general education course in humanities; 2/ a hybrid experience (part traditional seminar, part career preparation); or 3/ an open venue for skills training, for example, in digital humanities. It may be that some combination of all three would work and that diverse learning experiences could be integrated into the first and third year of our doctoral programs. Nevertheless, the overwhelming consensus was that bringing students together in some official capacity would create opportunities for collaborative research, joint mentorship, and more vibrant career-networking across departments. It would also serve to unify the graduate cohort in the humanities in a way that is felt to be missing today.

There were, of course, other elements of this new, nimbler model for Next Generation Humanities PhDs that we discussed at length. For example, during our White Paper "Boot Camp" each participant was asked to identify the two most important elements in a new humanities PhD model, and some called out the following components that the group as a whole did not prioritize: 1/ digital learning and pedagogy; 2/ a more adaptive dissertation model that seeks to alter the current cultural norms; 3/ the active and attentive fostering of diversity from the admissions process through to degree conferral; and 4/ the cultivation of external partnerships to build bridges realize meaningful and participatory community engagement between graduate students, faculty, and the larger community. We intend to revisit these elements when we return as a group in fall 2017 to take stock and plan ahead.

What's Next?

The immediate plans for continuing the "Living Humanities" PhD project involve utilizing the remaining grant funds of $3400 to host an event at the start of the 2017-2018 academic year to share the outcomes with the Fordham GSAS community and local partners. In addition to highlighting our conclusions, we aim to continue to build the momentum of the movement we have started. A segment of the event will also be devoted to gathering feedback on and creating early buy-in for possible pilot implementations that will move us closer to the submission in November 2017 of an implementation grant.

The most significant continuation of the project, however, will be through the specific recommendations that emerged from the group work on the six cross-cutting elements that were presented at the 17 May 2017 meeting. Representing the distillation of the five abstract planning themes with which we began, these six elements are one of the most valuable products of the "Living Humanities" PhD project, providing a clear framework for the new doctoral education model to which humanities departments can adhere while also building on their own strengths. While the full set of these recommendations can be found in Appendix 7, "Short Reports with Recommendations," what follows are those recommendations that we believe we can implement by only minor expansion of existing resources and within a reasonable timeframe.

Holistic Career Preparation:

    a. Create closer ties between GSAS graduate programs and alumni: alumni panels, an alumni newsletter, alumni involvement in all aspects of GSAS.

    b. Build a genuine partnership between GSAS and Career Services and include representation by Career Services at all graduate student orientation events, onstage.

Internal Coordination for External Partnerships:

    a. Capitalize on what is already happening at Fordham and create a database of existing external partnerships to explore and mine for career preparation opportunities for GSAS students.

    b. Use our existing relations with WFUV, the Fordham University Press, and public humanities organizations like the Paideia Institute for Humanistic Study and the Bartow-Pell Mansion Museum to create even richer collaborative pilots. Departments that have initiated strong partnerships along these lines (e.g., the Classics Department's engagement with the Paideia Institute) would be encouraged to reach out to and invite other humanities departments to join in such pilots.

    c. Add engaged/service learning components to the curricula of our humanities doctoral programs.

Responsible and Responsive Mentoring:

    a. Immediately begin to collect data and feedback that will help programs diagnose Fordham's specific strengths and weaknesses in the area of advisor/advisee relationships. This data collection should include (but is not limited to) a survey of all current Fordham PhDs and PhD alumni, focusing on mentor-mentee relationships, demographics, and job outcomes.

    b. Drawing on the latest research on best practices in graduate mentoring and the survey results, craft a streamlined, two-page guide for mentors and mentees along with an assessment window for future tailoring and iterative improvements.

    c. Guide programs and individual mentors towards reimagining the graduate mentor/mentee relationship. Cultivate a roster of mentors beyond the department and beyond the academy.

    d. Experiment with pilot projects on digital mentoring.

Digital Scholarship, Learning, and Pedagogy:

    a. Create an instructional technology training series for graduate students, possibly including a digital humanities (DH) boot camp.

    b. Explore the creation of a GSAS-wide seminar on the science of teaching and learning.

    c. Create systems of incentive and reward for undertaking collaborative research and publication projects that involve faculty and graduate students—and possibly scholars working outside the academy—in joint endeavors.

    d. Explore and encourage the inclusion of new forms of doctoral work that make the most of digital platforms, exhibition tools, and analytic programs.

Public Scholarship and Partnerships:

    a. Pilot the three-minute video dissertation requirement.
    b. Re-examine current dissertation practices to create space for public engagement while still maintaining the required academic rigor.
    c. Encourage turning faculty into practitioners of, and advocates for, public scholarship.

Admissions, Recruitment, and Retention:

    a. Encourage information-sharing and collaboration among GSAS humanities doctoral programs to develop a shared sustainable model that re-conceptualizes recruitment to include planned outreach, monitoring, and assessment strategies to more diverse and non-traditional graduate student communities.
    b. Pilot the elimination of the GRE requirement in admissions decision-making, as research has shown that GRE scores are not a proxy for knowledge (the test is a measure of skills), nor are they a strong predictor of academic or professional success. Additionally, they further disadvantages applicants from underrepresented groups.
    c. Explore the feasibility of establishing a bridge program or eased/fast-tracked admissions process for undergraduate applicants from underrepresented communities to select PhD programs.

Key recommendations from these elements will be integrated into the ongoing GSAS-level strategic planning initiative, which is, fortuitously, entering its formative stage. During the coming year, the GSAS will focus on renewing the goals of the graduate school and creating the initiatives necessary to achieve these goals, and we hope to apply recommendations in the areas of admissions, mentoring, and public scholarship in particular.

Appendix 1: Project Timeline

14 October 2016: Initial Project Meeting
Location:	O'Hare Special Collections Room, 4th Floor, Walsh Library
Time:	2:45 - 5:45 p.m.
Featured Speaker:	Lenny Cassuto, PhD
	Professor of English, Fordham University

15 November 2016: Ensure Access and Inclusion
Location:	Campbell Multipurpose Room
Time:	1 – 3 p.m.

30 November 2016: Revitalize Learning Outcomes
Location:	Campbell Multipurpose Room
Time:	3 - 6 p.m.
Featured Speaker:	Sidonie Smith, PhD
	Mary Fair Croushore Professor of the Humanities
	Director of the Institute for the Humanities, University of Michigan

18 January 2017: Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem
Location:	Walsh O'Hare Special Collections
Time:	10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

22 February 2017: Mentor the Whole Person: Career-Wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships
Location:	Walsh O'Hare Special Collections
Time:	10 a.m. – 1 p.m.
Featured Speaker:	Jason Pedicone, PhD
	President of the Paideia Institute for Humanistic Study

29 March 2017: Incorporate Service and Community Engagement
Location:	Walsh O'Hare Special Collections
Time:	10 a.m. – 1 p.m.
	Featured Speaker: Matthew Jacobson, PhD
	William Robertson Coe Professor of American Studies and History at Yale University and co-founder of the Public Humanities Initiative

17 May 2017: Cultivate and Curate a Living Humanities PhD Model
Location:	Campbell Multipurpose Room
Time:	12 – 3 p.m.

Appendix 2: Project Members

<u>Project Directors</u>

Eva Badowska, PhD is Dean of GSAS and Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature. She also publishes on Victorian fiction, feminist theory, psychoanalytic theory and Polish literature and film. Dr. Badowska has a volume of essays, co-edited with Francesca Parmeggiani, on Krzysztof Kieślowski's ten-film series on the Ten Commandments, *Of Elephants and Toothaches: Ethics, Politics and Religion in Krzysztof Kieślowski's Decalogue* (2016), which includes Dr. Badowska's essay, "States of Exception: Politics and Poetics in Decalogue Six."

Matthew McGowan, PhD is Associate Professor and Chair of Classics. He is a member of the University Task Force on the Future of Liberal Education and is Vice-President for Outreach and Executive Board Member of the Society for Classical Studies. He has also served as Director of the Fordham College Honors Program (2013-15) and President of the NY Classical Club (2009-15). He sits on the Advisory Board for the NEH-sponsored Fellowship to the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae in Munich, Germany.

<u>Core Planning Group</u>
The Core Planning Group comprises a diverse and inclusive range of humanities departmental faculty at both junior and senior levels; current PhD candidates in several humanities disciplines; recent humanities alumni; and senior administrators within GSAS and Arts and Sciences.

Nathan Ballantyne, PhD is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University. He writes on questions concerning good inquiry and biases. From 2012 to 2016, he served as Fordham's Philosophy Placement Director and he is currently chair of a new departmental committee on non-academic placement.

John Bugg, PhD is Associate Professor of English and the author of *Five Long Winters: The Trials of British Romanticism* (2014), and *The Joseph Johnson Letterbook* (2016). His essays and reviews have appeared in *PMLA*, *ELH*, *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, *TLS*, *Romanticism*, *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, *European Romantic Review*, and *Keats-Shelley Journal*. He is co-founder, with Sarah Zimmerman, of the Fordham Romanticism Group.

Leonard Cassuto, PhD is Professor of English and the author or editor of eight books on American literature and culture, most recently *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It* (2015), inspired by the monthly column, "The Graduate Adviser," that he writes for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. His *Hard-Boiled Sentimentality: The Secret History of American Crime Stories* was nominated for the Edgar and Macavity Awards and named one of the Ten Best Books of 2008 in the crime and mystery category by *The Los Angeles Times*. He is also an award-winning journalist who writes on subjects ranging from science to sports, in venues from *The New York Times* to *salon.com*.

Elizabeth Cornell, PhD is the Director of Communications for Fordham IT. Prior to that she was a post-doctoral fellow in English at Fordham. She is a member of the steering committees for NYC Digital Humanities and the Fordham Digital Humanities Working Group, is on the advisory board for Digital Stowe, and is a contributing editor to Digital Yoknapatawpha.

Steven D'Agustino, PhD is the Director of Online Learning in the Office of the Provost. He supports the development and enhancement of distance learning at Fordham University. He has written a number of grants and published research analyzing the enhancement of teaching and learning through the integration of technology in real and virtual environments.

John Drummond, PhD is the Robert Southwell, S.J. Distinguished Professor in the Humanities and Professor of Philosophy. He specializes in early phenomenology, especially that of Edmund Husserl. His research interests are in phenomenology and the philosophy of mind, including issues concerning intentionality, cognition, the emotions, value theory, and ethics.

David Hamlin, PhD is Associate Professor of History and the author of *Work and Play: The Production and Consumption of Toys in Germany 1870-1914* (2007). He writes on the development of consumer industries in Germany and the impact of consumer culture on Wilhemine German society, and he has recently started a project on the construction of formal and informal empires in southeast Europe, particularly Romania, from the Congress of Berlin to the collapse of the Third Reich.

Glenn Hendler, PhD is Chair of the English Department, Professor of English and American Studies, and the author of *Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. He is the co-editor of two editions of *Keywords for American Cultural Studies* with Bruce Burgett, as well as the accompanying interactive website for research and pedagogy, the Keywords Collaboratory. His most recent publications include articles on the 1863 New York City Draft Riots, and on the life and legacy of David Bowie.

Lisa Radakovich Holsberg is a PhD candidate in Theology. She comes to her doctoral studies from a career in the arts as a professional soprano, composer, and music educator (www.raceforthesky.org). Her research centers on questions of creativity, freedom, evil, and suffering in theological aesthetics, anthropology, and religious philosophy; and particularly in the 20th-century thought of Simone Weil and Nikolai Berdyaev.

J. Patrick Hornbeck, II, PhD is Chair and Associate Professor of Theology, as well as Co-Chair of Fordham's ongoing strategic planning process. He studies and teaches the history of Christianity, with special attention to groups and individuals who have been labeled heterodox or have been otherwise marginalized in communities of faith. He brings to the work of the "Living Humanities" PhD program his experience as a former co-chair of the Digital Humanities Working Group at Fordham.

Matthew Keil, PhD is a high school teacher in the New York City public school system where he teaches classes in Latin, Greek, and classical philosophy. He is also an adjunct professor for the City University of New York, Fordham University, and Saint John's University, teaching classes in Greek and Latin classics in translation, Roman history, and classical mythology. He recently received his doctorate in Classics from Fordham University.

Julie Kim, PhD is Associate Professor of English. Her research and teaching interests include eighteenth-century British and early American literature, as well as race, science, and empire in the early Atlantic world. She has published articles and essays on Afro-Caribbean medicine, indigenous land rights and resistance, and natural history and is working on a book about the politics and practice of botany in the Age of Revolutions.

Melissa Labonte, PhD is Associate Dean for Strategic Initiatives in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and Associate Professor of Political Science at Fordham University. Her research and teaching interests include the United Nations system, humanitarian politics, peacebuilding, multilateral peace operations, conflict resolution, human rights, and West African politics. She currently serves as UN Liaison for the International Studies Association; sub-Saharan Africa Advisor to Freedom House; Core

Planning Committee member of the Campaign to Elect a Woman UN Secretary-General; and member of the Advisory Committee responsible for publishing the official papers of UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon.

Erin McKenna is a fifth-year PhD student in Classical Philology. She holds an A.B. in Classics from Harvard University and is currently working on a dissertation examining the response to Lucretius in Roman love elegy. For the past two years, Erin has also been involved with the Paideia Institute's Aequora program, promoting active Latin pedagogy and bringing after school Latin instruction to young children in the Bronx.

Nicholas Paul, PhD is Associate Professor of History and Associate Chair for Graduate Studies at Fordham University. His research and teaching concerns political culture in the central middle ages, particularly the intersection between the world of nobility and the history of the crusades. His first book, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (2012) won the John Nicholas Brown prize of the Medieval Academy of America.

Sarah Peirce, PhD is a classical archaeologist with special interests in Greek vase-painting iconography, Greek religion, and Greek social history. She has a book forthcoming on the "Lenaia Vases" and Bacchic cult and has published reviews and articles on Greek art and religion. She has long-standing ties to the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, Greek and has served as chair of its Committee on Admissions and as co-director of its summer session.

Samantha Sabalis is the graduate research assistant and coordinator for the "Living Humanities" PhD project. She is a PhD student in English, and her dissertation focuses on manuals of religious instruction in fifteenth-century England. She also works as a museum educator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Dewis Shallcross is the Director of Student Development and Special Events for the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. She develops alternative career and professional development programming, working with student representatives and school administrators to provide programming that is relevant to and enriches a diverse graduate student body.

Kirsten Swinth, PhD is Associate Professor of History and American Studies. She is the author of *Painting Professionals: Women Artists and the Development of Modern American Art, 1870-1930* (2001) and *"Having It All": A Real Feminist History* (forthcoming). Her current research interests focus on the social and cultural history of the U.S. since World War II, particularly the intersections among gender, cultural, and labor and economic history. She has interests as well in visual and popular culture, and has worked to design a "pop-up" exhibition to travel to elementary and middle schools with the Gilder Lehrman Institute.

Magda Teter, PhD is Shvidler Chair in Judaic Studies and Professor of History. She specializes in early modern religious and cultural history, with emphasis on Jewish-Christian relations, the politics of religion, and transmission of culture among Jews and Christians across Europe in the early modern period. She is the author of *Jews and Heretics in Catholic Poland* (2006), *Sinners on Trial* (2011), and a co-editor of and contributor to *Social and Cultural Boundaries in Pre-Modern Poland* (2010).

James Van Wyck, PhD is a Postdoctoral Teaching Fellow in the English Department at Fordham University. He speaks and writes regularly on graduate education, and has been dubbed one of the "nation's most articulate graduate student advocates" by the editors of *The ABD Survival Guide*. His writing can be found in venues such as *The New England Quarterly*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, and *Inside Higher Ed*.

The Constituent Advisory Group includes stakeholders hailing from within the University (e.g. faculty or staff professionals working in a particular area relevant to planning, such as Career Services, Modern Languages and Literatures, Fordham University Press, and International Initiatives). It also includes representatives from a range of humanities-oriented organizations located in the Bronx and New York City, Fordham's closest community allies, and features cultural institutions, historical societies, museums, nongovernmental organizations, and other professional sectors who are sources of knowledge and expertise concerning applied humanities training and career pathways for humanities PhDs.

Malkah Bressler is the President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA) and a sixth-year doctoral candidate in the English Department. She is excited to be part of the Living Humanities PhD NEH Project as she is committed to promoting the study of the Humanities. As a member of the MLA's inaugural Connected Academics proseminar, Malkah is keen to bring her experience to the group.

Elizabeth Butterworth is the Director of Development at the Paideia Institute, where she manages Aequora, a program through which Paideia partners with universities, schools, and community organizations to expand access to the classical humanities by offering introductory Latin classes for low-income elementary and middle school students. She is also the Program Advisor for the Bluhm Scholarship honors program in the Division of Classics at Hunter College. After completing her A.B. in Classics at Princeton University, Liz won a Rhodes Scholarship to attend Oxford, where she earned an M.Sc in Comparative and International Education in 2013 and an M.St in Latin and Greek Languages and Literature in 2014.

Brendan Cahill is the Executive Director of the Institute of International Humanitarian Affairs, an independent academic center reporting to the President of Fordham University that acts a bridge between the academic and humanitarian communities. He has directed graduate and undergraduate programs throughout the world.

Martin Chase, S.J., PhD is Professor of English and Medieval Studies and Associate Editor of Traditio. He publishes in the areas of Old Norse and medieval English language and literature—most recently, *Eddic, Skaldic, and Beyond* (2014).

James Grossman, PhD is Executive Director of the American Historical Association. Formerly Vice President for Research and Education at the Newberry Library, he has taught at the University of Chicago and the University of California, San Diego. He is the author of *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration* and *A Chance to Make Good: African-Americans, 1900-1929*. With Anthony Grafton, he is also the author of "No More Plan B" (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 9, 2011) and "Plan C" (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 1, 2011).

Jeannine Hill-Fletcher, PhD is Professor of Theology and Faculty Director of Service-Learning in Fordham's Dorothy Day Center for Service and Justice. Her primary area of research in theologies of religious diversity has focused on the intersection with other forms of difference including gender and race, with an interest in the material and political impact of theological projects. Her books include *Monopoly on Salvation? A Christian Approach to Religious Pluralism* (2005) and *Motherhood as Metaphor: Engendering Interreligious Dialogue* (2013). Her current work is informed by membership in the Northwest Bronx Community and Clergy Coalition, a multi-generational, multi-religious and multi-racial grassroots organization working for social change.

Lisa Lancia is the Director of International Initiatives with the Office of the Provost at Fordham University. As Fordham's Senior International Officer (SIO), she is responsible for leading strategic internationalization, as well as overseeing study abroad, international services, Fordham's ESL program,

and managing development of international agreements. Ms. Lancia previously held senior administrative positions with Pace University School of Law in New York, with the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations in Croatia and Haiti and with the United Nations Compensation Commission at UN HQ in Geneva, Switzerland.

Laura K. Morreale, PhD is the Associate Director of Medieval Studies at Fordham University. Her scholarly work has appeared in both traditional publications and in non-traditional venues in conjunction with new, digital modes of humanities research. She is an advocate for greater openness to the intellectual marketplace for graduate school alumni who work in MA- and PhD-compatible careers, and is working closely with professional organizations to address the matter among medieval scholars. In 2013, she initiated a series of alumni panels at Fordham entitled "Compatible Careers for Medievalists," featuring MA and PhD recipients working outside of the professorate.

Fredric W. Nachbaur is currently Director of Fordham University Press. In addition to overseeing the operations of the press, he acquires in cultural studies, education, history, media and communication, religion, and urban studies. He has a B.A. in English from William Paterson University and a Masters in Urban Studies from Fordham University.

Francesca Parmeggiani, PhD is Associate Professor of Italian and Comparative Literature at Fordham University. She holds degrees from the University of Bologna (Italy) and Indiana University Bloomington, and she teaches 20th- and 21st-century Italian literature and cinema. Her research focuses on contemporary Italian literature and culture with special interests in the representation and interplay of politics and religion in literature and film, women's writing, and feminist theory.

Jeannine Pinto, PhD is the University Assessment Officer at Fordham University where she provides faculty and administrators support for assessment projects at the course, program, school, and institutional levels. In collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research she can supply data, data analysis, and methodological consultation upon request. She is a member of the Association for Psychological Science (APS), the Association of Institutional Research (AIR) and its northeast regional affiliate (NEAIR), and the Assessment Network of New York (ANNY).

Doug Steward, PhD is Associate Director of Programs at the Modern Language Association, where he works to ensure that English and foreign language departments have the information they need to advocate effectively for themselves. Previously, he taught American literature and critical theory at Truman State University and Franklin & Marshall College.

Emily L. Swafford, PhD is manager of academic affairs at the American Historical Association, where she directs the Mellon-funded Career Diversity for Historians initiative. She also staffs the AHA's Teaching Division and supports their work on history education at the K-12, undergraduate, and graduate level. She earned a PhD in 20th-century US history at the University of Chicago. Her book manuscript chronicles the transnational origins of US military family policy in the early Cold War.

Appendix 3: Meeting Agendas

Planning Theme: Ensure Access and Inclusion

Tuesday, November 15, 2016
3:00pm-6:00pm
Campbell Multipurpose Room

GROUP I: Recruitment, Application, and Admissions

Your group's work focuses on the application and admissions process, including criteria of evaluation, process of review, and the role of faculty and other committees in admissions decisions. Based on your background reading, professional experience, and personal reflection, your group should make 5-6 concrete recommendations to reform the process of admission to graduate programs in the humanities that aid in achieving the goals of assuring access and inclusion.
Guiding questions to consider in this process include:

- In what specific ways can the application process be reconfigured to attract communities not currently being reached? Where possible, link your recommendation to a particular, envisioned outcome.
- How should we rethink our model of the ideal applicant at GSAS?
- How do we need to rethink "merit" within GSAS programs?
- How can we help faculty committees avoid what Posselt calls "homophily"? What would a new model look like?
- How must we rethink recruitment to generate diverse candidate pools? What types of best practice elements and platforms should we prioritize within GSAS to help meet this goal?
- What other aspects of humanities graduate programs would need to be reformed to make these programs attractive and viable for applicants from underrepresented groups?

GROUP II: Retention, Mentoring, and Student Support

Your group's work focuses on key aspects of graduate student retention: mentoring students from diverse backgrounds and ensuring a diverse and inclusive scholarly community in humanities PhD programs. Based on your background reading, professional experience, and personal reflection, your group should make 5-6 concrete recommendations for reforming the models and modes of mentoring in the new PhD in the humanities to ensure diversity and inclusion.

- What should the goals of effective mentoring look like in the new humanities PhD? Upon what norms and principles should they be developed?
- How best should mentoring relationships be set up (ensuring alignment with identified principles) and how might they be measured and assessed?
- What types of training may be needed in preparation for implementation of mentoring programs and initiatives?
- What new and innovative models of student financial support might work to ensure diversity, access, and inclusion?
- How should GSAS engage within/across relevant University units to build buy-in and explore opportunities for sufficient, long-term resourcing of the models we envision developing and implementing?

Planning Theme: Revitalize Learning Outcomes

Wednesday, November 30, 2016
3:00pm-6:00pm
Campbell Multipurpose Room

Featured Speaker:
Sidonie Smith, PhD
Mary Fair Croushore Professor of the Humanities
Director of the Institute for the Humanities
University of Michigan

Guiding Questions:
Consideration of a new model for the humanities PhD must begin by re-imagining the student learning outcomes.

- What will PhD holders of the future be required to know?
- What will they be required to know how to do?
- How will their experience as PhD students be transformative for themselves and the public sphere?
- What are the key student learning objectives (SLOs) for the PhD in a humanities discipline today and for the future?
- How must the design of the doctorate be re-imagined to meet these new SLOs?
- What types of requirements will be helpful in facilitating the achievement of these SLOs?
- Is the dissertation still the necessary formative experience of the PhD in the humanities? If not, what other formative experiences might be proposed? If yes, what alternative formats might the dissertation take? What are the SLOs for the dissertation in particular?
- What role might experiential and practical learning play in a new humanities PhD?
- How might collaboration and team approaches figure into a new humanities PhD?
- How will a model humanities PhD ensure the mastery of the discipline while remaining open to interdisciplinary possibilities? Or is this a false opposition?
- What might the progression of requirements look like in a particular discipline?
- What is the ideal time to degree for a humanities PhD, assuming that there is consensus that current average times to degree are too long? How will the SLOs be met in that new time frame?

Planning Theme: Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem

Wednesday, 18 January 2017
10:00am – 1:00pm
Special Collections Room, Walsh Library (4ᵗʰ floor)

Key Readings:

- Alonso, Carlos J., et al. *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature*. Modern Language Association, May 2014. [especially the section on recommendations, pp. 12-19]

- Bass, Randy. "Disrupting Ourselves: The Problem of Learning in Higher Education," *EduCause Review*, 21 Mar. 2012.

- Cohen, Daniel J. and Tom Scheinfeldt, eds. *Hacking the Academy: New Approaches to Scholarship and Teaching from Digital Humanities.* University of Michigan Press, 2013.
    - o In "Hacking Teaching":
        - ▪ Anastasia Salter, "Hacking the Dissertation"
    - o In "Hacking Institutions":
        - ▪ Stephen Ramsay and Adam Turner, "Interdisciplinary Centers and Spaces"
- Grossman, James and Emily Swafford. "Graduate Education Reconsidered." *Perspectives on History: The Newsmagazine of the American Historical Association*, April 2016.

- Lippincott, Joan K. and Diane Goldenberg-Hart. Digital Scholarship Centers: Trends & Good Practice. *Coalition for Networked Information,* 2014*.*

- Smith, Sidonie. "Part 2: The Everyday Life of the Humanities Now," in *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times.* University of Michigan Press, 2015.

Optional Readings:

- Ayers, Edward L. Does Digital Scholarship Have a Future? *EduCause Review,* 5 Aug. 2013.

- Cohen, Daniel J. and Tom Scheinfeldt, eds. *Hacking the Academy: New Approaches to Scholarship and Teaching from Digital Humanities*. University of Michigan Press, 2013.
    - o In "Hacking Scholarship":
        - ▪ Unsworth, John. "The Crisis of Audience and the Open-Access Solution"
        - ▪ Kelly, Mills. "Making Digital Scholarship Count"
        - ▪ Cohen, Daniel J., Stephen Ramsay, and Kathleen Fitzpatrick. "Open-Access and Scholarly Values: A Conversation"
    - o In "Hacking Teaching":
        - ▪ Davidson, Cathy. "Assessment versus Innovation"
    - o In "Hacking Institutions":
        - ▪ Madsen, Christine. "The Wrong Business for Libraries"
        - ▪ Prom, Christopher J. "Reimagining Academic Archives"

- Dalgeish, Melissa and Daniel Powell. "Building the Alternative Academy." *Graduate Training in the 21ˢᵗ Century* (#alt-academy). See the current clusters here, which focus on re-imagining the dissertation.

- Davidson, Cathy. Introduction. *Now You See It: How Technology and Brain Science Will Transform Schools and Business for the 21st Century.* Penguin Books, 2012, pp. 1-22.

- Klost, Peter H., Debra Rudder Lohe, and Chuck Sweetman. "Rethinking and Unthinking the Graduate Seminar." *Pedagogy*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2015, pp. 19–30.

- Lombrozo, Tania. "Embracing the Humanities: A Perspective from Physics," National Public Radio, 25 July 2016

- Segran, Elizabeth. "What Can You Do with a Humanities PhD Anyway?" *The Atlantic,* 31 Mar. 2014.

Planning Theme: Mentor the Whole Person – Career-Wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships

Wednesday, 22 February 2017
10:00am – 1:00pm
Special Collections Room, Walsh Library (4ᵗʰ floor)

I. Setting the Stage: Presentations on Professionalization and Network Building

- ❖ **Dr. Jason Pedicone, President of the Paideia Institute,** on the Legion Project, a national association of classicists working outside the academy.
- ❖ An overview of current initiatives for mentorship and career counseling of PhD students in humanities disciplines at Fordham:
    - o **John Drummond, Robert Southwell, S.J. Distinguished Professor in the Humanities** on initiatives in Philosophy.
    - o **Matthew McGowan, Associate Professor of Classics** on initiatives in Classics.
    - o **Julie Kim, Associate Professor of English and Interim Director of Graduate Studies** and **Leonard Cassuto, Professor of English** on initiatives in English.
- ❖ Q&A and Conversation with the presenters.

II. Promising Partnerships and Building our own Networks

Over 70 percent of jobs are never posted. Submitting a résumé to an online job posting, without a contact at that organization, works less than 4 percent of the time. …Networks are essential to finding career opportunities. Graduate programs, especially in the humanities and social sciences, need to foster alumni networks. Alumni can serve as mentors, providing advice on professional documents and introducing students to professional contacts.
(L. Maren Wood. "How Administrators Can Help Prepare PhDs for Nonfaculty Careers")

In this session, we'll focus on creating a concrete list of the resources that are already available at Fordham and beyond to build our alumni and employer networks.
First share your lists of three PhD students who have gone on to work outside the academy and three potential employer contacts who might be receptive to hiring PhD graduates or mentoring current PhD students. Then, based on your background reading, your knowledge of existing initiatives (both within and outside the university), and your personal experience, make two or three concrete suggestions to develop and expand Fordham's PhD alumni networks and employer partnerships to provide PhD students with contacts, internships, and career advice from a variety of fields.

III. Curricular Development

The goal is to create an environment that doesn't force students to choose whether they're on the public humanities track or the professoriate track, but to allow people the flexibility to move back and forth and explore a variety of options.
(Stephen Aron, quoted in Vimal Patel, "Opening Doors for the PhD")

In this session, we'll focus on suggesting short-term and long-term changes that can be made to doctoral curricula to better prepare students for a range of careers as well as for the professoriate. Consider not only revising the graduate seminar and coursework, but also adding new modules or mini-courses,

expanding the definition of the graduate assistantship, and encouraging alternative types of scholarship and publication.

Based on your discussion, create at least two short-term suggestions and one long-term goal for adapting the doctoral curriculum, based on background readings and your own experience as a (current or former) PhD student, administrator, faculty member, or potential employer.

Guiding questions could include:
- What kind of public-facing scholarship is happening in your department, field, or intellectual circle? How could such scholarship be incorporated into the curriculum?
- What we do already: how do we already teach the five basic skills that James Grossman names (communication, collaboration, quantitative literacy, intellectual self-confidence, and digital literacy)? How can we build these skills further in the graduate seminar and beyond?
- What we can do now: What immediate changes can we implement in coursework and the dissertation to increase professionalization?
- What we can do in the future: What practicable, long-term goals can we set in our disciplines and in the graduate school more generally to better integrate professionalization into the curriculum?

IV. Reflection on Current Practices and Mentorship

Many of your colleagues quietly tell students "I know the market is tough, but you're so good, you'll get the job." Whether true or not, it increases the incorrect, noxious perception that the best students get academic jobs (sometimes true, more often not) and that anyone who doesn't get one is not one of the best (sometimes true, more often not). You should make it impossible for your department's graduate students to hear that without having also heard that other outcomes are valued…and seen what some of those outcomes are.
(Anne Krook, "How Faculty Can Support Graduate Students and Postdocs Looking for Non-Academic Work")

As part of our discussion of preparing graduate students for careers outside academia, we must confront the elephant in the room – the "entrenched culture" that surrounds us and can influence our own attitudes and responses. Part of being a good mentor is being aware of our own biases and preconceptions, as well as those our students will encounter within the department or university as a whole from their professors and their fellow graduate students.
In this session, we'll consider not only how we could do better, but also what we already do well in mentoring our students and preparing them for a range of careers both within and outside academia.

Guiding questions could include:
- What's not working – if many students come in to graduate programs with an open mind about non-academic careers, what do we do to discourage these options?
- What is working – what are some examples of successful mentorship of students seeking non-academic employment? How can we capitalize on these positive examples?
- What can we do (as individuals, as leaders in departments, as members of the institution) to combat general misconceptions about and prejudices against non-academic career options?

Planning Theme: Incorporate Service and Community Engagement

Wednesday, 29 March 2017
10:00am – 1:00pm
Special Collections Room, Walsh Library (4ᵗʰ floor)

Preparatory Agenda

10:00-10:30: Reflections on the future of the NEH and of studying the humanities in the United States
(with Beth Torres, Grants Officer, Office of Sponsored Programs)
10:30-11:30: Presentation by Matthew Frye Jacobson, William Robertson Coe Professor of American
Studies and History, and founder of the Public Humanities Institute at Yale University
11:30-12:00: Q&A with Professor Jacobson
12:00-1:00: Working Lunch
Break-out group discussions on Service and Community Engagement

Discussion Questions:

Evaluating Roadblocks to Service and Community Engagement Initiatives:

1. In *Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Community Engagement in Higher Education*, Susan Sturm et al. (7) note that "while higher education as a sector has publicly acknowledged that it has an important public mission, there remains a gap between intention and practice. The problem lies in the incongruity between institutions' stated mission and their cultural and institutional architecture, which is not currently set up to fulfill that mission."
How does Fordham's mission encourage service and community engagement? How does the current cultural and institutional architecture foster such projects, and how might it be holding them back?

2. David Cooper argues that a turn away from civic engagement is reflected in humanities scholarship, which has shifted from contributing to "public problem solving and public creation" to focusing on "the strategy of postmodernism" whose goal is more to fragment than to create community. To what extent do you agree with Cooper's assessment? How/why have humanities disciplines turned away from projects that benefit communities?

Forging a Path for Service and Community Engagement Initiatives:

1. What different publics do you address through your graduate teaching, scholarship, and administration? What opportunities do you see to expand your work to other publics?
2. How do you support, share, and/or reward public engagement projects and partnerships in your department?
3. Where do you see opportunities to create a more publicly-engaged department/institution? Who are potential allies, and what possibilities do you see for collaboration with other departments and with community partners?

Next Steps for the "Living Humanities" PhD Model for the 21st Century

Wednesday, 17 May, 2017
12:00 pm to 3:00 pm
Campbell Multipurpose Room, Campbell Hall

Preparatory Agenda

12:00 to 12:15 – Lunch and Opening Remarks

12:15 to 1:15 – Short presentations from subgroups on their findings

1:15 to 1:45 – General discussion about subgroup presentations and reports

1:45 to 2:45 – Planning out next steps

Subgroups for Creating a "Living Humanities" PhD Model:

1. *Holistic Career Preparation* (Nathan Ballantyne, Elizabeth Butterworth, Lenny Cassuto, Laura Morreale, Dewis Shallcross, Emily Swafford)
2. *Internal Coordination for External Partnerships* (Malkah Bressler, James Grossman, Lisa Lancia, Matthew McGowan, Francesca Parmeggiani)
3. *Holistic Mentoring (Faculty Roles)* (Martin Chase, John Drummond, David Hamlin, Matthew Keil, James Van Wyck)
4. *Digital Learning/Pedagogy as Method and Object/Collaboration* (Eva Badowska, Elizabeth Cornell, Steve D'Agustino, Glenn Hendler, Lisa Holsberg, Nicholas Paul)
5. *Public Scholarship* (Brendan Cahill, Patrick Hornbeck, Fredric Nachbaur, Samantha Sabalis, Magda Teter)
6. *Admissions: Recruitment, Applications, Retention* (Jeannine Hill-Fletcher, Julie Kim, Melissa Labonte, Erin McKenna, Doug Steward, Jeannine Pinto)

Setting the Stage for the White Paper – Project Planning Themes:

- Ensure Access and Inclusion
- Revitalize Learning Outcomes
- Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem
- Mentor the Whole Person: Career-Wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships
- Incorporate Service and Community Engagement

"Living Humanities" PhD White Paper Writing Boot Camp

Monday, 19 June, 2017
11 am to 2 pm
Seminar Room 3-05, Fordham Law School
Lincoln Center Campus

Preparatory Agenda

11:00 to 11:10 – Opening Remarks and Coffee

11:10 to 11:45 – Workshop the "What Worked and What Didn't" section of the white paper

11:45 to 12:00 – Lunch Break

12:00 to 1:00 – Draft the "What Does It All Mean" section of the white paper

1:00 to 1:30 – Workshop the "What's Next" section of the white paper

1:30 to 2:00 – Discussion of the white paper as a whole (comments on "What Happened" and the appendices)

White Paper Guidelines:

- **What Happened?** Provide a detailed synopsis of grant activities: committee meetings, graduate student activities, research conducted with peer institutions, invited sessions with experts, etc. Please include a list of major participants. (This may be an appendix, which would not count toward ten-page suggested limit.) *1-2 pages*
- **What Worked and What Didn't?** Give a detailed account of major accomplishments and report on what was stellar and what might have been approached or structured differently if your institution were to begin again. What did you wish you had known when starting the project? What advice would you give to future grantees? *2-3 pages*
- **What Does It All Mean?** Include reflections on the impact the project had on campus for graduate students, faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, external partners, and more. How have this year's experiences defined or altered your thinking about the problems facing doctoral education in the humanities across the country? *3-4 pages*
- **What's Next?** Tell us how you plan to continue your project and report on how you are disseminating your experiences beyond the white paper. *1-2 pages*

Appendix 4: Reading Lists

Ensure Access and Inclusion

Cassuto, Leonard. "Admissions." *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It*, Harvard University Press, 2015, pp. 17-56.

Cassuto, Leonard and Julie R. Posselt. "Inside the Graduate-Admissions Process: A Study Finds the Pervasive Misuse of Test Scores and Too Much Homophily." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 31 Jan. 2016, www.chronicle.com/article/Inside-the-Graduate-Admissions/235093.

Committee on Race, Diversity and Inclusion. "2016 GPSS Report on Race, Diversity and Inclusion." Yale University Graduate and Professional Student Senate, 2016, gpss.yale.edu/sites/default/files/ gpss_diversity_report.pdf.

Davidson, Martin N. and Lynn Foster-Johnson. "Mentoring in the Preparation of Graduate Researchers of Color." *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 71, no. 4, 2001, pp. 549-74.

"Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Strategic Plan." Rackham Graduate School, University of Michigan, 2016, dei.rackham.umich.edu.

Flaherty, Colleen. "Feeling Isolated and Excluded." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 20 Oct. 2016, www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/10/20/surveys-graduate-students-reveal-campus-climate-issues-yale-michigan.

López, Marissa. "On Mentoring First Generation and Graduate Students of Color." *Race and Ethnicity: The Site of the Committee on the Literature of People of Color in the United States and Canada*, 2 Jul. 2014, clpc.commons.mla.org/on-mentoring-first-generation-and-graduate-students-of-color.

Mason, Mary Ann, Nicholas H. Wolfinger, and Marc Goulden. "The Graduate School Years: New Demographics, Old Thinking." *Do Babies Matter? Gender and Family in the Ivory Tower*, Rutgers University Press, 2013, pp. 8-26.

Posselt, Julie R. *Inside Graduate Admissions: Merit, Diversity, and Faculty Gatekeeping*. Harvard University Press, 2015.

Smith, Sidonie. "Diversifying the Humanities." *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times*, University of Michigan Press, 2015, pp. 165-9.

Task Force on Inclusion and Diversity. "Report to APA Board of Officers for the November 2014 Meeting." American Philosophical Association, 2014, www.apaonline.org/resource/resmgr/Docs/diversitytaskforcereport.pdf

Revitalize Learning Outcomes

Alonso, Carlos J., et al. *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature*. Modern Language Association, May 2014, www.mla.org/pdf/ taskforcedocstudy2014.pdf.

Barsky, Robert, et al. *White Paper on the Future of the PhD in the Humanities.* Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, December 2013, www.acfas.ca/ sites/default/files/fichiers/1536/white_paper_on_the_future_of_the_phd_in_the_ humanities_dec_2013_1.pdf.

Berman, Russell A. "Essay Defending the MLA Report on Doctoral Education." *Inside Higher Ed*, 21 Jul. 2014, www.insidehighered.com/views/2014/07/21/essay-defending-mla-report-doctoral-education#sthash.29bQpSzp.PF9S4z3r.dpbs.

Grossman, James and Emily Swafford. "Graduate Education Reconsidered." *Perspectives on History: The Newsmagazine of the American Historical Association,* April 2016, www.historians.org /publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/april-2016/graduate-education-reconsidered.

Grafton, Anthony T., and James Grossman. "No More Plan B: A Very Modest Proposal for Graduate Programs in History." *Perspectives on History: Newsmagazine of the American Historical Association*, October 2011, www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/october-2011/no-more-plan-b.

Krebs, Paula. "A New Humanities Ph.D." *Inside Higher Ed*, 24 May 2010, www.insidehighered.com/ views/2010/05/24/krebs.

Smith, Sidonie. *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times.* University of Michigan Press, 2015, pp. 1-32 and 111-174.

Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem

Alonso, Carlos J., et al. *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature.* Modern Language Association, May 2014, pp. 12-19, apps.mla.org/pdf/taskforcedocstudy2014.pdf

Bass, Randall. "Disrupting Ourselves: The Problem of Learning in Higher Education." *EduCause Review*, 21 Mar. 2012, er.educause.edu/articles/2012/3/disrupting-ourselves-the-problem-of-learning-in-higher-education.

Cohen, Daniel J. and Tom Scheinfeldt, eds. *Hacking the Academy: New Approaches to Scholarship and Teaching from Digital Humanities.* University of Michigan Press, 2013, dx.doi.org/ 10.3998/dh.12172434.0001.001

Grossman, James and Emily Swafford. "Graduate Education Reconsidered." *Perspectives on History: The Newsmagazine of the American Historical Association*, April 2016, www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/april-2016/graduate-education-reconsidered

Lippincott, Joan K. and Diane Goldenberg-Hart. Digital Scholarship Centers: Trends & Good Practice. *Coalition for Networked Information,* 2014, www.cni.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/CNI-Digitial-Schol.-Centers-report-2014.web_.pdf

Smith, Sidonie. "Part 2: The Everyday Life of the Humanities Now." *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times*, University of Michigan Press, 2015.

Davidson, Cathy. Introduction. *Now You See It: How Technology and Brain Science Will Transform Schools and Business for the 21st Century*, Penguin Books, 2012, pp. 1-22.

Klost, Peter H., Debra Rudder Lohe, and Chuck Sweetman. "Rethinking and Unthinking the Graduate Seminar." *Pedagogy*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2015, pp. 19–30.

Mentor the Whole Person – Career-Wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships

"5 Ways to Broaden the Doctoral Curriculum," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 29 Jan. 2017, http://www.chronicle.com/article/5-Ways-to-Broaden-the/239018.

Cassuto, Leonard. "The Alt-Ac Job Search: A Case Study," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 23 Nov. 2015, www.chronicle.com/article/The-Alt-Ac-Job-Search-A-Case/234295.

Cassuto, Leonard. "The Job Market Reconceived," *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It*, Harvard University Press, 2015, pp. 183-208.

Council of Graduate Schools and Educational Testing Service. *Pathways Through Graduate School and Into Careers.* Report from the Commission on Pathways Through Graduate School and Into Careers, Educational Testing Service, 2012, pathwaysreport.org/rsc/pdf/19089_PathwaysRept_Links.pdf.

Krook, Anne. "From Being to Doing: Mobilizing the Humanities." Future Humanities: Transforming Graduate Studies for the Future of Canada Conference, Institute for the Public Life of Arts and Ideas, May 2015, McGill University, Montreal, annekrook.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/McGill-talk-May-2015.pdf.

Krook, Anne. "How Faculty Can Support Graduate Students and PostDocs Looking for Non-Academic Work," *Anne Krook: Practical Workplace Advice*, annekrook.com/?page_id=1074.

Patel, Vimal. "Opening Doors for the Ph.D.," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 29 Jan. 2017, www.chronicle.com/article/Opening-Doors-for-the-PhD/239031.

Rogers, Katina. "Humanities Unbound: Supporting Careers and Scholarship Beyond the Tenure Track," University of Virginia, 2013, libraprod.lib.virginia.edu/catalog/libra-oa:3480.

Wood, L. Maren. "How Administrators Can Help Prepare Ph.D.s for Nonfaculty Careers," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 29, 2017, www.chronicle.com/article/How-Administrators-Can-Help/239017.

Incorporate Service and Community Engagement

Cooper, David D. "Can Civic Engagement Rescue the Humanities?" *Going Public: Civic and Community Engagement.* Edited by Hiram E. Fitzgerald and Judith Primavera, Michigan State Press, 2010, pp. 83-92.

Ellison, Julie and Timothy K. Eatman. "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University." *Imagining America*, 2008, surface.syr.edu/ia/16.

Goettel, Robin and Jamie Haft. "Imagining America—Engaged Scholarship for the Arts, Humanities, and Design." *Imagining America*, 2010, surface.syr.edu/ia/12.

Jay, Gregory. "The Engaged Humanities: Principles and Practices for Public Scholarship and Teaching." *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship* vol. 3, no. 1, 2012, jces.ua.edu/the-engaged-humanities-principles-and-practices-for-public-scholarship-and-teaching/.

Shorris, Earl. "On the Uses of a Liberal Education: As a Weapon in the Hands of the Restless Poor." *Harper's Magazine*, Sept. 1997, harpers.org/archive/1997/09/ii-as-a-weapon-in-the-hands-of-the-restless-poor/.

Sturm, Susan; Eatman, Timothy; Saltmarch, John; and Bush, Adam, "Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Community Engagement in Higher Education." *Imagining America*, 2011, surface.syr.edu/ia/17.

Appendix 5: Meeting Minutes

1) Inaugural Meeting

Friday, October 14, 2016

This meeting introduced the "Living Humanities" PhD project and explored the goals of the project – what is no longer working in doctoral education and what avenues can we pursue to address these issues? The meeting began with a talk by Lenny Cassuto, Professor of English at Fordham and author of The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It, *in which he gave an overview of doctoral education in the twentieth century and highlighted how our current system often makes its students and graduates unhappy. After Professor Cassuto's remarks, participants at the meeting divided into small groups for a World Cafe format discussion centered on five key questions. Each group was encouraged to make notes on large posters and post-it notes to accompany their discussion and underline key points. Find below the notes made by participants during these sessions.*

1) **Imagine how we would change the PhD in the humanities if we got in the business of preparing students for a variety of jobs that do exist. How would we connect how we teach with what our students actually do with their degrees?**
    a. Key questions:
        i. How do we connect how we teach with what our students do with their degrees?
        ii. What are the goals (Student Learning Objectives) of a graduate seminar?
        iii. Are there recognizable categories of non-academic jobs that students go to?
        iv. Is the PhD a fulfilling project in and of itself?
    b. Suggestions:
        i. Publicize internship opportunities
        ii. Support from professors for a variety of fields, not just academia
        iii. Unpack skills we want students to develop.
        iv. Experiential learning and internships
        v. Professional orientation in the first year of graduate programs (model on Philosophy Department ProSeminar)
        vi. Outreach to place graduate students in high school teaching contexts
        vii. Teach fields of discourse but also marketable skills
    c. Where students go outside academia:
        i. Foundations
        ii. High schools
        iii. Public organizations
        iv. University presses
        v. Libraries
        vi. Museums
    d. What skills do students develop in the PhD?
        i. Research skills and organization
        ii. Moving from conceptualizing to synthesizing; synthesizing information
        iii. Collaboration
        iv. Audience
        v. Organizing work
        vi. Grant writing
    e. Conferences:

        i. Steps create skills? Apply, present, do Q&A
       ii. Create a narrative
      iii. Create a public resource
      iv. Get students to write conference papers rather than term papers

f. Emphasis on Collaboration, both among students and profs:
        i. Offer opportunities for collaboration
       ii. Create collaborative writing assignments
      iii. Coordinate between courses
      iv. Interdisciplinarity – encourage students to go outside their departments
       v. Team up to spark discussions

g. Pedagogies:
        i. Keywords
       ii. Wikis

h. Existing programs/resources:
        i. Connected Academics – MLA program on jobs outside academia
       ii. See "Humanities Unbound" database, Bethany Nowviskie

2) **"We must embrace the teaching mission of graduate study as well as the research mission" (Cassuto 51). Do you agree? How is this this issue inflected at a Jesuit university like ours? What would it mean to embrace the teaching mission of graduate study? Are there other (alternative or complementary) ways to "fix the graduate school mess"?**

a. Key questions:
        i. What is student-centered graduate education, and do faculty members lack time to do this?
       ii. Why emphasize pedagogy if relatively few students will teach?
      iii. Does the Jesuit context enter into faculty discussions of graduate teaching?

b. Suggestions**:**
        i. Constructivist model
       ii. Interdisciplinarity:
           1. Undergrads as students in many subjects, not just your class
           2. Should graduate students teach outside their own departments?
      iii. Teaching apprentice
      iv. Train educators
       v. Expand definition of teaching (where to teach). Teaching in many locations (eg. team leading). Education is everywhere; needed skills.
      vi. Creating discipline-specific pedagogy with universal value.
     vii. EP6 seminar on Public Communication for graduate students across departments.
    viii. A "flipped" seminar – students take charge of class
      ix. Contribute to national dialogue about the importance of pedagogy

c. Why grad programs should emphasize pedagogy:
        i. See the value of pedagogy beyond the teaching profession: training students to be a communicator, leader, person who disseminates knowledge.

d. The teaching of graduate students:
        i. Faculty have few discussions on graduate teaching pedagogy
       ii. Too few conversations about teaching graduate students
      iii. Teaching graduate students to write as well as teach

e. Teaching graduate students and training students to teach at Fordham:

          i. Comparatively, Fordham seems to do a good job. The initiative in Preparing Future Faculty will help to create greater uniformity of pedagogical training.

          ii. Fordham's Teaching Practicum in English – two semesters, with a mentor for each graduate student. Fordham as having good placement at teaching universities.

f. Other thoughts:

          i. Distinction between research and knowledge.

          ii. Value of traditional disciplinary skills and research

3) **Should PhD education in the humanities be reconceived along the lines of "skills-based approaches"? Why, or why not? Or, to what extent? How would we go about identifying appropriate PhD-level "skills"? What are these skills?**

    a. Key questions:

        i. What do we mean by skills?

        ii. What do employers outside the academy value in doctoral education in the humanities?

        iii. How long will it take to institute change? A generation or more?

        iv. **What skills are we talking about? Eg. to have "French for Reading"**

        v. **How to separate out skills? But disciplines have their own rules**

        vi. Why are we skills OR content-driven? Is it an either/or question?

        vii. **What options are available to humanities PhDs?**

        viii. **The idea of "radical change" is out there. What's it going to look like?**

        ix.

    b. Suggestions:

        i. Understanding what we're trying to accomplish in terms of "human being" (<humanities)

        ii. Teaching is a skill (art): developed with different kinds of input.

        iii. Sacrificing discipline-specific requirements

        iv. Public-scholarship is important => communication is key (gearing toward undergraduates, the public)

        v. Partnering with universities to develop service-learning

        vi. Service projects for faculty and students to get a broader perspective (outside of the academy)

        vii. Move from teacher-centered to student-centered education

        viii. Skills: analysis, shift emphasis in courses that exist

        ix. Introducing a "coding bootcamp"

    c. Philology – being revitalized!

    d. Skills are discipline-specific. Without content, it is impossible to cultivate these skills

    e. Perception is of a lack of cohesion within programs to structure content. Small programs cannot offer specialized [?]

    f. Mixing MA and PhD students: implications?

        i. Drawbacks with regard to perceived rigor

        ii. Advantages to common professional development

4) **What are the goals of the PhD degree as currently practiced? What would it mean to reconceive doctoral education in the humanities as liberal education? What would be the benefits of such a reconceptualization of the purpose of the PhD degree? What would be lost, if anything? Should there be a core curriculum for the new humanities PhD?**

    a. Key questions:

      i. The history of graduate education is a history of canons – what replaces this in the new "knowledge economy"?

     ii. Is the problem the dissertation or how we support the learning and mastery process to earning a PhD?

   iii. Liberal education – what does it mean to be a good human being?

   iv. Disciplines – are they dinosaurs?

    v. Managing expectations: how well do we do this?

   vi. Do we teach our students to want academic and/or research positions? Or do they come into our programs seeking this?

  vii. Do we know any PhD students who regret the process of researching and writing their dissertations? Mastery of the project? Is the value here maybe missed?

 viii. How do we define knowledge?

   ix. Should we ditch disciplines to save higher education?

    x. What other organizing principle can we use besides "disciplines" to rethink higher education?

   xi. Liberal education=breadth and depth, but graduate school is all depth. How to give breadth to graduate education?

  xii. What helps prepare graduate students?

b. Suggestions:

      i. Mentoring

     ii. Multidisiplinarity

   iii. Produce the idea in our students that "liberally educating" is critical to pursuing freedom of the individual

   iv. See students as FREE RATIONAL AGENTS

    v. We need to thematize how students can take their training into other professions outside of academia

   vi. Challenge the canon, tradition, power structures

  vii. Graduate students as taught to challenge power structures, not to create them

 viii. Lived reality of graduate student life needs to be considered when discussing happy vs. unhappy PhDs

c. Challenges to graduate education today:

      i. MOOCs

     ii. Self-publishing: challenges and examples

   iii. Social media vs. professional journalism

   iv. Academic freedom/knowledge quest vs. academic responsibility

    v. Higher education as an echo chamber

d. Thinking about a new model:

      i. To think about a new model, we need to get over ourselves

     ii. Humility and maturity

   iii. Think about loss and gains

   iv. Failing to engage as needed on this question:

        1. Deeply held norms

        2. "Professional self"

        3. Identity narratives – and the notion of who is a "professional"

    v. Medieval universities (Jesuit) vs. German Research universities (rather than English…)

e. Should there be a core curriculum for graduate education? What would it require?

        i. Core disciplinary training
        ii. Higher education history
        iii. What else? Need to go outside the box
        iv. Compatible careers
        v. Must include rigor and clarity of thought/writing

5) **How could/should the PhD in the humanities <u>go public</u>?**
   a. Medium/message, form/platform
   b. Active pathway to employment in positions other than academy
   c. Trained to share research with non-specialists
   d. (N)PR model?
   e. "Knowledge Unlatched" – a database that offers free access to scholarly content across the world
   f. What do we give up?
   g. How do we create these skills? Teach students to reach out
   h. How do we reward these skills?
   i. Internships
   j. Train for public engagement
   k. Digital humanities projects as a job market tool
   l. #publichumanities
   m. Reward system for "public" work
   n. Academic writing and clarity – universities should organize public talks
   o. Premise of the question:
          i. Do we have data on public engagement already? Probably more anecdotal accounts than data
          ii. How can a public orientation be a more respectable orientation? Problem in philosophy

2) Planning Theme "Ensure Access and Inclusion"

Tuesday, November 15, 2016

The meeting was divided into two groups of ten people. The first group addressed access and inclusion during Recruitment, Application, and Admissions. The second group addressed access and inclusion during students' time at Fordham, focusing on Retention, Mentoring, and Student Support.

To prepare for the meeting, both groups read extracts from Julie Posselt's Inside Graduate Admissions: Merit, Diversity, and Faculty Gatekeeping *(Harvard UP, 2015) and Leonard Cassuto's* The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It *(Harvard UP, 2015), as well as two recent reports on diversity and inclusion from Yale University and the University of Michigan. Each group aimed to produce five to six recommendations based on the readings and their discussion.*

Group I: Recruitment, Application, and Admissions

Introductory Remarks by Kirsten Swinth (KS) and Eva Badowska (EB)

- Noted value of readings, tone they set for group's deliberations: concrete and practical.
- Invited group members to think "visually" through the process of recruitment and admissions.
- Highlighted need to think about "range of actors" involved in the process, as well as need to think about how the process looks and feels from a variety of perspectives, especially those traditionally marginalized w/in academy.
- Noted that she took the group's goal to be in part about thinking about how to attract a broad and diverse applicant pool.
- Eva Badowska (EB) noted that Fordham's admissions processes are manifold: decentralized, dept-based. Departments conduct process by their own standards, which are crafted to align with state guidelines.

General Discussion

Focus on the GRE General Test

- Matthew Keil (MK) raised possibility of dispensing with GRE
- KS noted that multiple studies have shown GRE scores are not accurate predictors of success in graduate school. The question is: how does GRE impact admissions process?
    - EB noted that GRE is a deterrent, esp. at MA level
    - Malkah Bressler (MB) noted time commitment for GRE prep
    - KS underscored the relationship between GRE and privilege (test prep costs, etc)
    - EB noted that performance on standardized tests tied to socio-economic factors, also referenced her own experience taking the test abroad.
- Elizabeth Cornell (EC) reminded the group of Posselt's charge to admissions committees: take a holistic vision of applicant.
- EB noted that discarding GRE would have consequences: GRE scores play a role in rankings, for example.

Looking at Admissions Process from Applicant's POV

- KS noted that History department expects all potential PhD students to have had an interaction with their prospective mentors.
- During discussion of this point, it was observed that this may hurt applicants unfamiliar with process, or hesitant to reach out.
- James Van Wyck (JVW) referenced Jamaica Dale's observation that "US academia is structured around assumption that graduate students, adjuncts, and full-time professors have constant access to family wealth."
- KS: we need to communicate the message to students that we are concerned with their well-being.
- It was observed that "proving financial need" was a complicated process.
- JVW noted that we should challenge this presumption, and design admissions processes with disadvantaged/underrepresented as the norm, and not the exception.
- Doug Steward (DS) highlighted the ADE report, and noted that graduate schools need to "fish further upstream." Need to go out and find minority/underrepresented students; HCBUs often not targeted
- Nathan Ballantyne (NB) suggested connecting admissions data, admissions goals, and admissions committee members in departments
- NB noted that he would appreciate tools for creating a diverse pool of applicants. He observed that Silicon Valley has used apps that strip racial/social/institutional markers from application materials. Doing this has resulted in more diverse and talented hires.
- Blind Admissions Process?
- KS noted the tension of bringing a more diverse student body into poor job market (for traditional academic jobs) and noted that it was imperative to cultivate both a more diverse professoriate while allowing for open-ended career paths.
- KS: what kinds of career paths would be of interest to a more diverse graduate student population?
- KS: Need to work more intentionally with institutions in neighborhoods surrounding our campuses.

Recommendations based on the discussion:

1. **Offer guidelines about best practices for admissions to departments. Share data and studies regarding the GRE with departments. Send admissions data to admissions committee members.**
2. **Build pathway for PhDs to teach Service Learning Courses.**
3. **Offer guidelines and suggestions for applicants on website (outlining, for example, information about GREs).**
4. **Reach out to HCBUs via faculty contacts.**
5. **Advanced Funding for Accepted Students to help with transitional moments.**
6. **GRE forgiveness fund and/or Accept Unofficial GRE scores**
7. **Assess Fees/Funding from P.O.V. of Underrepresented Students**
8. **Rethink how we represent career trajectories to prospective students (Recruitment/website to be conducted with needs of underrepresented students in mind.**
9. **Since diversity means different things in different contexts, departments need to think about (value of) diversity in their particular contexts.**

10. **Holistic Review of Application Process.**

Group II: Retention, Mentoring, and Student Support

About mentoring a diverse body of students:

- Lack of diversity among mentors: Davidson and Foster-Johnson mention in "Mentoring in the Preparation of Graduate Researchers of Color" that mentors working with students of color are predominantly white males.
- Can also attempt to mentor all students in the same way, something that Davidson and Foster-Johnson emphasize is ineffective.
- Dewis Shallcross (DS): mentoring all students in the same way fails all students, as everyone has different issues.
- Mentors can also fall prey to homophily, molding students into versions of themselves.
- Mentors need training to work with under-represented groups; for instance, they can be "color-blind," seeing racism as a non-issue.
- Steven D'Agustino (SD): but we need to be careful about focusing on racial differences over other forms of diversity.
- Erin McKenna (EM): there are other forms of diversity that come with hidden identifiers; need to make students feel welcome and willing to admit their diversity.

Formal vs. informal mentorships:

- Jeannine Pinto (JP): could set up a checklist of requirements to fulfill in a mentorship, but basing a mentor relationship on a checklist can result in a mentor treating all his mentees in the same way. If you want the student to develop, you have to cater the mentorship to the particular student.
- EM: Formal mentorships can impede creating a relationship with the mentor, creating a focus on short-term rather than long-term goals.

Acquiring a mentor: how different from an advisor?

- John Drummond (JD): mentoring is not a question of individual mentoring early on in graduate study, as students haven't yet learned enough to select a mentor. Not sure who they want to work with or what they want to study.
- JD: instead of individual mentorship early on, the Philosophy Department holds a Proseminar, where students learn about issues in the profession.
- Mentorships as developing along the way in graduate school, not an instant relationship.
- DS: what's the difference between an advisor and a mentor? Do they have the same role?
- Melissa Labonte (ML): Yes, students come in (especially to the PhD) knowing who they want to work with, but often change their minds. Students don't know the difference between advisors and mentors.
- EM: what about an optional mentoring program that students and professors could sign up for early on?

- JP: when guiding a student, how much of your help is linked to the fact that he or she is working on a topic that you work on?

Mentorship of under-represented groups:

- EM: Students of color often feel unable to build these relationships on their own.
- DS: there's a burden on faculty members of color, as minority students can feel uncomfortable approaching other members of faculty.
- JD: need to hire more faculty member of color.
- SD: we've talked about the formal term of "mentor," but it's a cultural idea. Many students are not part of that culture.
- DS: mentorship as being about including students who don't traditionally fit into the community.
- EM: focus on training faculty to serve students from under-served populations. Idea that white students tend to be more confident about reaching out to faculty for help.
- SD: need to think carefully about what we do in academia, how we view our structures as universal, when actually they've been filtered through systems of oppression and force.
- Consider different types of diversity – what we learn, how we're brought up isn't always revealed by appearance. Eg. socio-economic status, having a family, educational background…
- Reliance on appearance to determine elements about people. Encourage mentors to talk to their students to discover who they are instead.
- EM: can't just say that you don't exclude groups, but also that you welcome all groups.

Good vs. Bad Mentorship – how to create good mentors:

- Lisa Holsberg (LH): problem of a "bad" advisor – unclear about distinction between an advisor and a mentor. Focus on vocabulary: have to address what a student can expect from an advisor and a mentor. Different faculty members have different rules, many implicit.
- JD: can set up expectations in the faculty handbook for each department.
- JP: students feel apprehensive approaching their mentors, telling them their issues. She notes that this apprehension was common among her friends who didn't finish their graduate degrees.
- JD: can encourage students to gravitate toward two or three members of faculty.
- SD: But you can't make every faculty member into a good mentor; so students have to evaluate faculty members before they approach them.
- SD: maybe separate successful mentorship dimensions – not just about completing the degree, but also about creating a relationship with the student.
- DS: why does the responsibility of building a mentorship rest solely on the student?
- ML: can come up with general principles of mentorship that can then be tailored to specific disciplines.
- SD: are mentorships discipline-specific?
- JD: the dissertation is discipline-specific, as students are writing for that discipline.
- LH: likes the idea of a Proseminar for first-year graduate students. First year as very disorienting, learning the norms of the new environment.
- Importance of having empathy for students, taken from Lenny Cassuto's *The Graduate School Mess.*

ML: need to think about capacities (goals of a mentor relationship). Work with the needs of students from different groups.

- Have to consider training and discipline specific knowledge and expertise
- Also consider students' capacities – the goals they have for the mentorship.
- Also have to consider training for students who don't know what to expect from a mentor relationship and from graduate school.
- LH: mentoring students one-on-one, but also bringing them into the community of the department. Goal of teaching students what coursework is like, setting up the payoff at the end.
- Getting rid of the "hazing" that many graduate students face.
- Mentorship as opening a window into departmental culture, practices, and the life of the mind.
- SD: could divide mentorship into different parts – academic progress, cultural ideas in the department, disciplinary issues, social issues.

Different modes of mentoring (LH):

- One-to-one (one faculty member, one student)
- One to many (one faculty member, many students, as in teaching)
- Many to one (department to individual students)
- Horizontal mentoring (student to student)

Different types:

- Transactional: clinical, advisory.
- Retention: try to build capacities, address students.
- Discipline-specific.

Taking Action:

- Matthew McGowan (MM): Have to consider how much has already been done for mentorship in the humanities as Fordham.
- To tackle diversity issues, we need diversity in our departments. To do that, we need money – a combination of institutional support and grants.
- ML: have to not only write that all groups are welcome, but show it through action. Applicants for faculty positions have read the language welcoming minorities and not believed it.
- Diversity Task Force has recommended mentorship training for all employees.
- EM: host a "Diversity Summit" and town hall where students can voice their concerns.
- Two groups already exist supporting under-represented groups: the LGBTQ group and the group for students of color. Need to give these groups more visibility, make them more inter-connected to academic and social life.
- MM: we have a great resource in the city of NTC, can help us to attract students. Perhaps create a graduate-level HEOP program to attract local students in the Bronx.
- JP: need to look at undergraduate teaching as well. Students can get discouraged with higher education as undergraduates, leading them not to apply to graduate school.
- EM: what about surveys where students can raise concerns and give feedback, identify as under-represented groups.

- JP: such surveys already exist, but the response rate is so low that it can't be reported.
- ML: what about focus groups to yield current trends?
- JP: a combination of surveys and focus groups shows students that the university cares.
- DS: Create a best practices sheet for students and mentors with recommended questions and how to ask them. At a departmental level, can start conversation with faculty.

Recommendations based on the discussion:

1. **Create a handbook to demystify mentoring**
2. **Create resources that allow us to say that we prioritize access and inclusion**
3. **Change how we support our students when they get to Fordham**
4. **Advocacy – retool resources for undergraduates so they cater to graduate students as well.**
5. **Develop a pipeline of faculty mentors from under-represented communities**
6. **Positively incentivize faculty members who are good mentors, recognize them publicly**
7. **Think more fully about what diversity means for different departments**

3) Planning Theme "Revitalize Learning Outcomes"

Wednesday, November 30, 2016

This meeting featured guest speaker Sidonie Smith, Mary Fair Croushore Professor of the Humanities at the University of Michigan and the author of Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times. *After a 25-minute presentation and a Q&A session, Professor Smith guided a workshop focusing on key questions about what a PhD is for and how we can create a new model for doctoral education.*

Presentation by Sidonie Smith

- After working as an external reviewer for several doctoral programs in English and Women's Studies, Smith emphasizes that the more kinds of higher-education institutions we have, the better we are.
- She's skeptical about the attitude that credentials from elite universities are automatically valuable.
- One of her focuses in the *Manifesto for the Humanities* is on conceptualizing a twenty-first education that is suited to the students choosing to do a doctorate, purposeful about the value of the PhD, and strategic in addressing concerns about attrition and the lack of diversity among the professoriate.
- When she served as president of the MLA in 2010, she made the dissertation her focus in her newsletter columns, discussing the different types of dissertations in different programs. This interest was based on an omission in a project she was involved with at the University of Michigan on graduate education – though the project addressed the graduate school climate, curriculum, and exams, it did not consider the dissertation at all.
- She is particularly dedicated to issues brought up by graduate students, and so her book addresses this audience – she perceives it as written to graduate students and overheard by faculty members.
- There have been many changes in the university in recent years, such as a retreat from public funding and a consolidation of corporate discourse for higher education.
- In this new climate, nostalgia is a major problem—the attitude of "if we could only return to the past" suggests that using past practices will help departments to weather the storm, which is an inadequate response to these changes.
- The new life of the academy involves several new factors that students need to know about to understand their new lives and roles as humanists.
  - The Distributed University:
    - not just focused on the single institution, but working with other ones.
    - Here and elsewhere, bounded and permeable, insular and open-access.
    - Through the university as a node, doctoral students can participate in projects like Humanities Without Walls – collaborative projects and opportunities outside their own universities.
  - Knowledge Structures:
    - new research terrain, including hardware and software, interdisciplinary and discipline-specific knowledge.
    - Also a focus on collaborating, not just sharing work but also giving credit. Students have multiple identities and different relationships to the digital.

- o New Media of Scholarly Communication:
  - multiple media and platforms, working to suit particular projects.
  - Shape-shifting communication.
  - "Bookishness," a term coined by Tara McPherson to explore the new and shifting forms of the book in the digital world (see Tara McPherson, "Scaling Vectors: Thoughts on the Future of Scholarly Communication" in *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 13.2 (2010)).
  - The book as no longer the sole gold standard for academic publishing.
  - Middle-state publishing (75-100 pg. publications), multimedia forms.
  - Questions about evolving terrain and what it would turn into in scholarly communication.
- o Open-Access Publishing:
  - Draws on Dan Cohen, Director of the Digital Public Library, to talk about the hidden cost to scholars in using a closed system. Invisibility of what you publish, only in print or behind a pay-wall online.
  - In trying to move to an open model, scholars can feel lost – issues with copyright, choosing the right form, rethinking the types of documents, and confronting hesitancy about going open.
  - When Smith posted her book on the University of Michigan's website, she opened it up for readers' comments and got a lot of valuable feedback. It was then published first in open-access and then in print.
  - Value of making work available open-access: Smith uses the example of Life Writing, a field she's involved in that is very international. So she wants to make the work available to people without strong libraries.
- o Teaching, learning, and pedagogy today:
  - Teaching now as a hybrid between traditional and participatory models.
  - "Post-course era" according to Randy Bass (see "Disrupting Ourselves: The Problem of Learning in Higher Education," *EduCause Review,* March 21, 2012).
  - Classes flipped, expertise now redistributed, work collaborative.
  - Using multiple modalities.
- So what do we do?
  - o Want doctoral students to be intellectually nimble, have new skills, have understanding of new modes of communication.
  - o Also want them to be passionate about teaching and able to be flexible in addressing different audiences.
  - o Finally, want these students to be able to translate their skills into many careers, not just the professoriate.
- How to do it:
  - o intervention in multiple kinds of professional development, new curricula, rethinking the dissertation.
  - o Expanding the graduate school community – no longer just faculty giving graduate education, but also faculty outside the institution, PhD graduates, and many other communities. Not just one student working individually with one or two faculty members.
- Have to talk about the "skills" involved in graduate education.
  - o Reduces the notion of education to a corporatist environment, but everything we do is a skill.
  - o We have to link what we do with the questions we're posing.

- o We also need a new word for "skills" that encompasses the many things graduates learn to do, like grant writing and reading as well as teaching and research.
- But these changes can be misunderstood – Smith has heard that her proposals are creating a two-tier system – a PhD and a PhD "lite." She responds that we are disadvantaging students if we stick to the twentieth-century model. We are looking for excellence in students, and normative standards do not assure excellence.
- Some faculty think any change turns graduate students into guinea pigs, which could harm them on the job market. But staying the same is also problematic and could stop them from competing well.
- Some say we can't make major changes until we address tenure, evaluation systems, and the prestige economy. But transforming a doctoral program involves many changes – takin on projects that change the way doctoral work is valued, for instance. We can't wait for major change to implement these smaller changes.

Q&A Session

John Bugg (JB): Could you talk about merging the problem of nostalgia with ways of unmooring the traditional dissertation?

Sidonie Smith (SS): nostalgia creates a moment that never existed, linked to ideal of what gets valued in the humanist dissertation, with the humanist as the center of the university. This system is about trying to find ways to insist on the value of liberal arts, but it constrains thinking in more imaginative ways. Also focuses on replicating oneself in students' work.

Lenny Cassuto (LC): Nostalgia as inaccurate – back in the "good old days," scholars wrote much fewer books. The dissertation was not meant to be a book itself, but a way of demonstrating the skill to write a book that could be produced later, during the job.

JB: There were also other dissertation models than the current four-chapter standard for English programs in the past that are not acknowledged – eg. the three-chapter dissertation, the critical edition, and the one-year dissertation. Critics of changing the dissertation act as though it was never different than it is now.

SS: The academy has changed before --new types of people coming in to the academy mean that academics had to come up with more objective ways of evaluating candidates than just calling a friend in another university when you were looking for someone to hire.

But there is a larger question – what is the PhD for? We have to think about this before we consider what it should look like.

- About making more interesting work in the degree, but not necessarily liked to time-to-degree.
- Thinking less about time-to-degree; instead, thinking about how students can flounder after exams because they struggle to come up with a large project. Also considering students of color trying to find a way to do what they want to do within the advisor's constraints.

Nicholas Paul (NP): Until recently, it wasn't the case that you had to have a dissertation and a PhD to get a teaching job in the UK. The PhD was seen as a process for evaluation; you didn't have to finish to get archival and museum jobs. The limit to a three-year dissertation in the UK has also led to a lower quality of research, now seen as being like an American M.A.

SS: So what is the PhD for? It's a credential, but not necessarily required.

Matthew McGowan (MM): With regard to nostalgia, Sidonie Smith and Lenny Cassuto distinguish between nostalgia and historical perspective.

SS: Habits in the PhD work alongside skills – what is this ensemble of things?

Laura Morreale (LM): More about a process than a final product; about the ability to go through the process to complete a project.

John Drummond (JD): About time-to-degree, considering lost students. Could we point to a problem before the dissertation? Are we not adequately preparing students beforehand for this project? Instead of skills/capacities, we could talk about activities, with an emphasis on both the activity and the result. It's not just about writing well, but also about being open to correction, being generous with ideas.

Lisa Holsberg (LH): Could use a combination of terms – skills and habits of mind, skills and accomplishments.

Erin McKenna (EM): You talked about graduate students needing to be multiply-skilled. But one thing graduate students struggle with is trying to get recognition for projects outside the dissertation, rather than being told they're taking time away from your PhD Do you have any strategies for communicating the value of these projects?

SS: Focus on these projects as not taking away from the PhD, but helping the student to focus more on their project.

James Van Wyck (JVW): Going back to nostalgia – the idea that "I survived, let's see if you can." Students are going to professors with alternate dissertation projects, but professors don't know how to evaluate these projects so say no.

Magda Teter (MT): One student proposed a final project in my class that was a computer game, but grounded his plan in research and a standard paper that could be evaluated, so I encouraged it.

SS: But students talk about how irritating it is to do an alternative project and have to write about it for people to evaluate it. We need more diverse pools to judge experimental projects. Also, it's the obligation of faculty members to figure out how to evaluate such projects.

At the University of Michigan, faculty used to rely on readers' reports from publishers to make decisions about tenure. There was pushback, as the readers didn't want that responsibility. It was a proxy for faculty members doing the work themselves.

Melissa Labonte (ML): This discussion harkens back to our discussion at the previous meeting on mentoring. We focused on how faculty have to take on new responsibilities for new learning environments. Do you get traction on making such changes at your institution?

SS: Not really, but colleagues are now recognizing that students aren't getting jobs, which can make them even more careful in advising students to do something different. But it could also lead to more openness, seeing innovation as a leg up on the job market. Hiring is different now at Michigan – the committees are not just replicating retirees. More flexible candidates can be exciting.

MT: The status quo is seen as rigid, but it is actually always evolving. It involves continuous change that adapts to suit the new environment.

SS: The Humanities Futures website, out of the Rackham Graduate School at Michigan, has resources to prepare graduate students for multiple futures. Faculty have said that they can't address all these, which will result in some changes.

Workshop Questions and Conclusions

The meeting participants were divided into three groups. These groups first addressed a common question, "what is the 21st century PhD for?" before focusing on particular aspects of doctoral education and how to create a new model.

Common Question – what is the 21st Century PhD for?

Group 1:

- Credential for a profession(s), vocational
- A PhD is for the time it gives to think deeply and persistently about a particular problem in humanities/liberal arts
- Not merely for a credential, but rather an opportunity for personal/intellectual growth
- An opportunity around a shared curiosity about a particular problem or set of problems, tradition of liberal learning.

Group 2:

- Process and endpoint of PhD, what it entails. Deep exploration of questions for further knowledge
- Opportunity to demonstrate excellence in field(s) through PhD work
- Value of a credential – PhD as having professional and societal value
- Ritual or initiation into culture of scholarship
- Self-fulfillment, exploration…

Group 3:

- Transformation of love/passion to conversations extending knowledge and dissemination of this knowledge in many formats
- Questioning existing structures, intensification of methods
- Cultural need for PhDs – PhDs as a societal good
- Self-fulfillment
- Individual and institutional values, institution's place

Table specific Questions:

1) **Articulate 2 possible models for PhD programs here at Fordham – based on this institution's specific strengths/capacities**
   a. Location in NYC/Bronx, insistence of our own selves as an asset to community: service-learning component to the PhD across disciplines. Already in train in the Classics department.
   b. Starts with using our Jesuit identity to connect with this massive international network of Jesuit schools. Letterhead of Fordham as a ticket of entry for those interested in teaching at a secondary level, recognition of Jesuit identity and how this might appeal to certain kinds of schools.

    c. Adding internships to graduate education, using our location in NYC because of all the opportunities. Not on top of courses, but in place of a course (student teaching at high school, advertising, publishing, museums). Create connections with these institutions.

    d. Individual development plan would start at beginning of student's career and factor in some of these potential capacities

2) Brainstorm what students need to accomplish the PhD degree – what activities, skills, processes, etc. are ideal to focus on and because those things are not only found in the classroom – what outside of classroom elements/characteristics would need to be developed?

    a. Agnostic about the degree to which the PhD program does these things.

    b. Classics: reading, analyzing, synthesizing, conducting research, interpreting, communicating to different audiences, independent thought, self-discipline, curiosity, humanistic values

    c. Possibilities: numeracy, digital literacy, appreciation/value for aesthetics?

    d. Where outside the classroom do students develop these things? Online communities, conferences, peer groups, local organizations, institutes

    e. Additional: coding, design architecture, collaborative skills, mapping, leadership, grant writing, writing public policy documents/white papers, human subjects research, engaging publics in scholarly work, using knowledge collaboratively in communities, advocacy…

3) What are the components/structural elements of a Living PhD – what should they be and how would they be animated for students?

    a. Courses: that would introduce students to general disciplinary methods and given the size of our programs, would have to be general enough to teach the broader skills rather than focus on one area in particular. Through the lens of a particular faculty research, but addressing wider skills.

    b. Socialization/Professionalization: to create institutional citizens and professionalize students by requiring internships outside the university or within it. Individualized plans – eg. Student who doesn't want to go into a teaching career, can replace Practicum with labor in a university office. Different type of training. Also using NYC, connecting to outside internships.

    c. Capstone project – flexible, but would it be allowed by NY state requirements? Open up possibilities for students to implement their passion and demonstrate new knowledge, skills, methodologies. Driven by more flexible areas applicable to future career plans than the dissertation.

4) Planning Theme "Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem"

Wednesday, 18 January 2017

This meeting was facilitated by Steve D'Agustino, PhD, Director of Online Learning at Fordham's School for Professional and Continuing Studies, and was divided into two parts.

In the first part, participants went around the room and read seven quotations on higher education and the new learning ecosystem from the recommended readings for the meeting. For each quotation, they wrote a response on a Post-it note and posted it alongside the quotation.

In the second part, participants congregated in discussion groups based on their favorite quotations, then synthesized the main points of their discussion and shared them with the whole group.

Find below the minutes for the group discussion; those interested in reading all the participants' comments on the quotations can find a full transcript starting on p. 26.

Part II: Group Discussion

About Quotation 1:

"The tendency to devalue teacher preparation in parts of doctoral education is at odds with the ever-growing national pursuit of effective teaching that can optimize student learning. Dedicated and well-prepared teachers are crucial to the strength of our society. Our doctoral students need to know about the rapidly evolving landscape of higher education in the United States – one that includes online learning – as well as the comprehensive community colleges that serve forty-four percent of all undergraduates in the United States and nearly half of all undergraduates of color."

> Carlos J. Alonso, et al. *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature*, Modern Language Association (2014), 11.

Lisa Holsberg (LH): The group had significant objections to the way the quotation is structured – it points to a set of values that are data-driven and implies that there's a national move for this teaching (which is a suspect statement).

This call for community college teaching looks nice, but plays out differently in reality.

Fordham has a strong teaching practicum in many departments – perhaps smaller departments without the resources to do this could band together to form a joint, strong teaching practicum?

The group also considered philosophies of teaching:

- Learning for students
- Accountable bodies – the teacher, the student, the discipline
- Traditional set-up of a teacher at a podium that has stayed constant for over 100 years.

Focus on the value of teaching outside classroom context, for instance in non-profit organizations.

There were a lot of Post-its on this quotation that focused on Fordham's strength in teaching, from its Jesuit foundation. But we should push to make teaching consistent across Fordham's departments.

Eva Badowska (EB): I was very influenced by Cathy Davidson's point of taking someone to a doctor's appointment with you and each focusing on different elements when the doctor talks. In this meeting, I'm listening from the perspective of planning for the white paper: we can emphasize contributing new

knowledge and maintaining tradition, infusing more teaching and more creative teaching into the curriculum.

Lenny Cassuto (LC): I'm paid to teach competently, but not well. There are few reward systems for good teaching.

John Drummond (JD): sees tradition as a handing down (that's the teaching function). But we also need research to make it a living tradition.

Steve D'Agustino (SD): The conversation for the last few minutes highlights the teaching strategy of the "Fish Bowl," in which several people have a discussion while others watch.

About Quotation 2:

…we should not lose sight of an equally ominous development: the extent to which doubts about the validity of the humanities in general and about graduate study in languages and literature in particular have permeated public discourse. The proliferation of responses from leaders in the profession underscores both the difficulty of articulating and the urgent need to articulate a convincing answer to the underlying challenge: why maintain doctoral study in the modern languages and literatures – or the rest of the humanities – at all?

Carlos J. Alonso, et al., *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature,* 3.

The group struggled to come up with a single, definitive answer for why PhDs in the humanities, especially in language and literature, are necessary.

If we focus only on functionality, then there is no purpose in going beyond an undergraduate degree to further study, and if we're only focusing on transferrable skills, the PhD is also not needed.

Several things could contribute to creating this answer – shortening the time to degree to better match the length of professional degrees like the JD or the MD could mean that the humanities degree is less singled-out, make the degree more possible/attractive.

One element that came up in discussion was the concept of the humanities as necessary for memory – they tell us how we got here. Moving to a new learning environment means forgetting the past but still maintaining a sense of historicity.

Humanities can serve as a "living archive," provide historical consciousness which is not just a value, but a responsibility in the humanities.

Many problems today stem from a lack of awareness about history. People keep drawing on the humanities to shore up their positions, so they do still have value.

Humanities can also combat the mis-appropriation of the past, eg. use of medieval and classical history by the alt-right movement.

Humanities PhDs also focus on learning; not just acquiring skills.

About Quotation 3:

Because change is our generation's byword, [futurist Alvin Toffler] believes we need to add new literary skills to the old three Rs of reading, writing, and arithmetic. He insists that the key literacy skill of the

twenty-first century is the ability to learn, unlearn and relearn … . The process of unlearning in order to relearn demands a new concept of knowledge not as a thing but as a process, not as a noun but as a verb, not as a grade-point average or a test but as a continuum… . And it means always relying on others to help in a process that is almost impossible to accomplish on your own.

Cathy N. Davidson, *Now You See It: How Technology and Brain Science Will Transform Schools and Business for the 21st Century* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012)*,* 12.

Matthew McGowan (MM): was struck by some of the Post-It comments: can unlearning really take place? We already do this learning, unlearning, and re-learning in the classroom.

Unlearning can be a response to change. Focus on readjusting our mode of acquiring knowledge and reassessing how we do it.

Combined the discussion with that of Quotation 4, also from Cathy Davidson's book –

About Quotation 4:

Is it possible for a whole society to have attention blindness? I think it is. We seem to be absorbed right now in counting the equivalent of digital basketballs: fretting about multitasking, worrying over distraction, barking about all the things our kids don't know. We're missing the gorilla in the room. We are missing the significance of the information age that is standing in the midst of our lives, defiantly thumping her chest. It's not that we haven't noticed the change. Actually, we're pretty obsessed with it. What we haven't done yet is rethink how we need to be organizing our institutions – our schools, our offices – to maximize the opportunities of our digital age.

Cathy N. Davidson, *Now You See It: How Technology and Brain Science Will Transform Schools and Business for the 21st Century* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012)*,* 12.

Patrick Hornbeck (PH): What is this gorilla – sees it as the significance of the information age. We haven't thought through the implications of it, so how do we learn to thrive in the new ecosystem? What practices challenge us? If we reframe change as a given, then we don't fear the gorilla but instead try to work with it.

For an example, take the recent French law that states that workers no longer have to check their emails at home, and may be entitled to overtime if they do.

How do we link this quotation to the previous Davidson quotation (Quotation 3) – where do we teach people to navigate this new world: in the PhD seminar, or earlier?

MM: We were struck by the appropriateness of these quotations for undergraduate education and expectations and how they are linked to what we do at the graduate level. The quotation on teaching (Quotation 1) highlights that undergraduate and graduate education are not so distinct.

Nicholas Paul (NP): The idea that instructors would share cultural assumptions with people in their twenties (their students) is less and less common. He finds himself forcing his students to use systems from his own age rather than theirs. What forms of communication should we be keeping?

Equally important is what technology should we adapt to – are we just conforming to product offerings rather than a tech revolution?

Lisa Holsberg (LH): Chasing after the next big thing could be a road to nowhere, as things are constantly changing. We're serving goals that we don't know we're serving, but learning to unlearn and relearn could be very valuable for this.

JD: Addressing Patrick Hornbeck – you give a pretty generous frame of the quotation. A fundamental question is getting missed: information is not good or bad in and of itself, it's what you do with it. If we focus on the significance of the information age, we're missing the main point.

PH: This goes back to the tradition of method and content, with a pushback at information that we deem irrelevant. We've thought of tradition as "memory" or a "living archive," but it varies from discipline to discipline. We have our own traditions of higher education, of the scholar and teacher, and we need to lift these up as well.

JD: Is worried about how information is used and for what purposes. There's an explosion of information today and no sense of what it means and what it's for. It's like money – not inherently good or bad, but based on how you use it, and it's dangerous when it becomes an end in and of itself.

Dewis Shallcross (DS): But this is a key question for the information age – who vets this information?

EB: The gorilla metaphor is very uncomfortable; it becomes the significance of the information age. I want to go back to the connection between the two Davidson quotations – what is the responsibility to the next generation that's going to come to these programs with brains that have been transformed. The next generation will bring these skills with them; it's us who will become the dinosaurs. There's something to be said for our role in keeping tradition alive, but how do we engage the next generation?

JD: Eva's new metaphor for the academy is the meeting ground between gorillas and dinosaurs.

Glenn Hendler (GH): Cathy Davidson talks about how she was bad at certain kinds of learning, especially with pencil and paper. But there are different types of learning, so some digital technologies that freak some people out will actually make others learn better.

David Hamlin (DH): Gorilla perhaps does not represent the digital age, but a different type of person growing out of the digital age. We're in a crisis of authority, flattening out knowledge and making it more accessible. So what then is the point of getting a PhD? What is the relationship between authority and this flattening regime – especially in the age of fake news (eg. "Pizzagate").

NP: It's not a fixed moment of cognitive change – the cognitive model is now changing fluidly, forever. I don't get the idea of stopping to understand it and relearn it – to say that new technologies represent one moment doesn't take into account the rate of change.

Laura Morreale (LM): We're still focused on the key skills of mastery and manipulation; we just do these things in different ways in the digital age. The desire to do both still remains. There's no need for anxiety about change and what the humanities do – we're still all about self-knowledge.

NP: So are those (mastery and manipulation) the "digital basketballs" that Davidson mentions?

LH: Our desire for self-knowledge functions as a constant, but education through contact with other people can awaken one's assumptions about what one's desires are.

About Quotation 5:

The profession must make a strong case to the public at large and especially to prospective employers that our doctoral programs prepare students for career paths throughout society, not only in higher education.

Carlos J. Alonso, et al., *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature,* 12.

LM: Interestingly, none of the people who chose this quotation were members of faculty.

One of the group's emphases was the way that PhD graduates outside academia can act as ambassadors for academia, translating it for outside audiences. There's so much "insider talk" in academia – specialized vocabulary, jargon. That's fine, but we should be prepared to talk to others outside the discipline, too. PhD graduates should be able to talk at different registers of interaction, being open to other people.

Fredric Nachbaur (FN): Has talked to graduate students about what they want. They want opportunities to work outside their departments to get new skills, but these opportunities are rare and not usually well-advertised.

We need to start having the conversations about what students want at the start of a program. We also need to remove the stigma of getting non-academic work, plus the emphasis on graduate placement only in academic positions.

Malkah Bressler (MB): We should also think not only about what we study but also the skills that we acquire through the graduate degree – we need to learn keywords for these skills.

LM: We need to remember that there are two sides to the equation when getting a job – the job seeker but also the employer.

Lisa Lancia (LL): We need to acknowledge that many PhD students won't get tenure-track academic jobs, so advisers should support them. Get students to reflect on what they learn to create a concrete skill set for different jobs – non-profit work, etc.

What do employers think when they see "PhD" after someone's name? We could create a focus group of potential employers.

DS: What does someone think when they see PhD on a resume? We have to think about the language candidates use and how they present themselves. Anne Krook is a valuable resource for PhD graduates who are thinking about going into jobs outside the academy.

LC: I like what I'm hearing. Back in grad school (when dinosaurs and gorillas roamed the earth…), I was the only one in my cohort who had worked between undergraduate and graduate school. It's important to train graduate students, like undergraduates, on how to get a career. Maybe career fairs could be geared towards graduate students – just going through recruiting can be invaluable.

Erin McKenna: That sounds like a great idea, but I've gotten advice on preparing a CV, not a resume. The conventions are not the same for non-academic jobs, eg. K-12 teaching. Seeing PhD on an application for a K-12 job means that the candidate will have less K-12 training and will have to be paid more.

Samantha Sabalis (SS): we need to teach graduate student to engage different publics. For instance, in museum work and K-12 teaching, experience working with children is often required, which many graduate students lack. We can encourage graduate students to pursue internships to learn about working with audiences outside the academy. There are also resources to help undergraduates with job searches (eg. Career Services for resume assistance) – can let graduate students know about these resources.

FN: Also have to think of changes in job searching – eg. there's an expectation now that you'll have a website that hosts your resume. Recruitment is moving more and more online.

DS: How do we get to the level of comfort – impostor syndrome among faculty about helping with non-academic job searches is a problem. Just because you don't know everything about a non-academic job search doesn't mean that you can't help at all.

Jeannine Pinto (JP): Could help get students comfortable with "pitching" themselves – eg. in graduate school I had an annual lunch where a faculty member who was not your mentor would take you out and you would have to pitch yourself to him or her.

EB: At the Council of Graduate Schools conference, there was a good idea from another university – students were required to create a three minute video to convey complex ideas: who you are, what you do, why it matters. Students resisted, but they seemed like perfect training for the "elevator pitch" of a student's project.

JD: We can achieve this through other means, too, like mock interviews with students. We ask them to create a 2-3 minute speech on their dissertation for non-specialist faculty members.

EB: The video serves many uses – it can be in students' porfolios for the job market, but also on the university's website or on students' own websites.

GH: The English department does a lot for mock interviews, but focuses mainly on the academic job market.

LM: To bring the discussion back to the value of PhD graduates in positions outside academia – we can benefit from PhDs with similar training performing different functions in society. Not alternate jobs, as they're equally as valuable.

MB: When we think of it in these terms, you're not diminishing passion for what was studied, just providing another route to purse it outside the academy.

PH: Pushing back at the idea that an academic interview can also prepare students for other jobs – it caters to the specific expectations of academia, not other careers. We need to prepare students for the different expectations of other career paths. For instance, a friend who got a PhD got a job in the Foreign Office in the UK; the PhD offered cachet in analyzing documents.

So what does a PhD mean in other careers, and how can we help students flout negative expectations for a PhD graduate?

EM: My next-door neighbor is the director of Multicultural Resource Center at Penn State University. He works as a mentor, and acts as an example of a job his students would want to do – could encourage them to get a PhD to pursue similar positions, open up more diversity in graduate school.

NP: Is the NEH thinking not only about institutions adapting but also society adapting to more PhDs outside the academy? Is that part of the conversation?

EB: Not really, but there is the idea that most PhDs outside the academy could contribute to revaluing the humanities PhD In webinars about this project, the NEH gives pointers about talking to government officials, keeping them posted about the project. There's an awareness that this is also a PR campaign for humanities PhDs.

MM: This project is deeply connected to the fate of the humanities, with a desire to get this information out to the public and to potential employers.

EB: I presented at a conference in D.C. on the project, focusing on how we're creating a community of discourse, advocates for cultural change. We're keeping the conversation alive.

<u>About Quotation 6:</u>

In how many courses do students feel a sense of community, a sense of mentorship, a sense of collective investment, a sense that what is being created matters?

Randy Bass, "Disrupting Ourselves: The Problem of Learning in Higher Education," *EduCause Review*, March 21, 2012

NP: The discussion focused on creating community inside the classroom. Dewis brought up an interesting point of how communities of graduate students develop in neighborhoods around New York City.

DS: Graduate students are a transient population, and hand down apartments to new graduate students when they leave. Communities develop focused on "safe" areas that are popular with particular departments and have been recommended by other graduate students in that department.

DS: We started with the question of who builds community in the classroom – the onus is on the students, as the teachers can create opportunities but students have to take them. Eg. students in inter-disciplinary fields have to enter discipline-specific communities.

NP: But some interdisciplinary programs develop communities that are very strong. Ways to create a community include: team projects, projects which become focuses of group interaction and include an element of risk (eg. presentations, podcasts, projects with public audiences).

EB: Bass's entire article is about undergraduate education, but he misses the idea that most undergraduate education uses a core curriculum – final goal based on many courses working together rather than individual classes.

GH: But the undergraduate core has few connections between courses.

LC: We also don't have a community to talk about teaching a course together (eg. bring together all teachers of a particular course to discuss strategies).

JD: In graduate education there are many ways of developing community not tied to the classroom. Eg. graduate symposia run by other students.

LC: One post-it mentioned a good idea – to link graduate courses together to speak to one another.

DS: I think we focused mainly on ways to create communities within departments, but what about the Fordham-wide community?

<u>Conclusions:</u>

SD: The challenge for me in this activity was not saying anything. Cathy Davidson focuses on decentering, with the faculty member not at the center for teaching. What is left in the middle? What techniques did you see? Did you feel me as the facilitator in these discussions?

Part I: Quotations and Post-It Responses

1) "The tendency to devalue teacher preparation in parts of doctoral education is at odds with the ever-growing national pursuit of effective teaching that can optimize student learning. Dedicated and well-prepared teachers are crucial to the strength of our society. Our doctoral students need to know about the rapidly evolving landscape of higher education in the United

States – one that includes online learning – as well as the comprehensive community colleges that serve forty-four percent of all undergraduates in the United States and nearly half of all undergraduates of color."

Carlos J. Alonso, et al. *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature*. Modern Language Association (2014), 11.

a. How we respond to the trend of a two-tier system: teaching vs. research?

b. I think that revamping doctoral education could be the "demonstration" piece that is needed?

c. And the biggest challenge in teaching graduate students is to put the student first – graduate education could learn a lot from the good strides made in K-12 education.

d. Wow. Eye-opening – and raises the question: why aren't our PhDs serving these needs?

e. Yes, education needs to be available to a wider population in various formats. Flexibility!

f. "Doctoral students need to know…" True. But they need the approval and support of faculty to explore the "rapidly evolving landscape of higher education."

g. What we are trying to teach in the humanities is almost impossible to teach online. Human interaction is essential.

   i. But large numbers of people are taking online humanities courses and teaching them. Do we try to stop them? Or do we make this better?

h. To what extent do we teach PhD students about the profession of higher ed – not just about their/our discipline but about the larger endeavor – its strengths, weaknesses, challenges, etc.? This goes hand in hand with "teacher prep."

i. Another way to put this is to say that what we do as teachers of graduate students is not very practical in that it does little to prepare students for the realities that they will face after graduation.

j. Yes, but how can students at an institution in which most faculty have no experience teaching at a community college level get the skills for this audience?

k. Certainly preparation and dedication are important. But what really is being taught at the doctoral level? Is it not more a way of interacting with material and with our interlocutors than anything else?

l. An interesting feature of teacher education is that, even as we train teachers, our graduate students teach us a good deal about teaching – new methods, uses of technology, etc.

m. Is teacher preparation really de-valued? What would valuing it look like?

   i. Our entire value and reward system devalues (and subordinates) teaching!

   ii. MLA may be correct, but I think Fordham actually does value our grad teaching, and in fact does prepare them for action in the world (as teachers).

   iii. Yes! And I hear from chairs at teaching-focused institutions that our grads are more hirable as a result.

n. Teaching is part of good mentoring and can be connected to research. All three require ample time.

o. Though I would nuance the premises ("national pursuit"? "Devalue"?), I agree we need to give teaching more presence throughout the curriculum, not just in self-contained pedagogy training.

p. True. Of course this immediately relates to grad student teaching and is an example of wanting grad students to do more while also shortening time to degree.

q. Expand faculty teaching/learning resources. Provide opportunities for faculty to learn from students and from each other.

2) …we should not lose sight of an equally ominous development: the extent to which doubts about the validity of the humanities in general and about graduate study in languages and literature in particular have permeated public discourse. The proliferation of responses from leaders in the profession underscores both the difficulty of articulating and the urgent need to articulate a convincing answer to the underlying challenge: why maintain doctoral study in the modern languages and literatures – or the rest of the humanities – at all?

Carlos J. Alonso, et al., *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature,* 3.

a. Do we want to reform/adapt if what lies behind this is the <u>more</u> ominous attempt to discredit scientific knowledge/expertise?

b. This is truly ominous – a dangerous challenge to the study of literature and language. But responding by saying we're useful – as useful as physics – will not help and is an argument bound to fail. We need a better answer.

c. I think that revamping doctoral education could be the "demonstration" piece that is needed.

   i. I agree that it can and should be one of them.

d. This may be done by better educating those within and outside the academy as to how doctoral education (and PhDs) contribute and can contribute to the greater good or world at large.

e. I think the answer to the general question is more discipline-specific than we in the humanities sometimes like to admit.

f. What better impetus to reconceive our mission to add emphasis to public reaching out? We can't bully, so we must persuade.

g. For the same reason we study humanities at any level – because humanities humanize us – and we need that!

h. "Ominous" is not a characterization one normally expects from the MLA.

i. Part of the problem here is selfishness and protectionism on the part of the "experts." Passion for these topics exists. It is only by maintaining openness to the various registers in which they can be practiced that the humanities can survive.

j. It's more important now than ever. We need humanities. Look at our incoming leader.

k. What can PhD-trained humanists do, beyond their specific disciplinary expertise, that differently trained people cannot (or at least not as well)? What makes us distinctive as citizens?

l. I wonder how effective this "underscoring" is. Perhaps we need to change the rhetoric so that it attracts and entices the hordes of naysayers (however much we find this approach distateful).

m. This is where both "public humanities" and "engagement" are essential. If humanities scholars are visibly present in public debates <u>and</u> engaged in their communities (however defined), that will help counter the skepticism better than yet another eloquent PR statement or manifesto.

n. Accessibility of knowledge and the training of people to disseminate knowledge in new ways are for me convincing answers.

o. Humanists are trained for depth and subtlety, not PR. It's a challenge.

p. I feel like an <u>elite</u> understanding of this "why" already exists. We need an <u>accessible</u> understanding and argument for "why the humanities."

q. Does there have to be a single answer as to "why"? I like the idea of a "proliferation of responses."

r. Do we have a common/shared understanding of what "language" and "literature" are?

s. Is the traditional justification of the humanities tied to the "alphabetic self," to older models of learning selfhood?

t. Change requires all to see beyond our certainties. "Haters gonna hate…" It is a difficult "place" and change also requires doing more than rebutting the challenge (defense vs. offense).

u. Addressing this problem involves <u>visionary</u> thinking (imagining a world without the humanities) and <u>deep</u> thinking (what is at stake for me, for the person next to me, for the person I have not met) about the values that are the ground of humanities thinking. Following this logic, one may well end up on the margins, subversive and prophetic.

3) Because change is our generation's byword, [futurist Alvin Toffler] believes we need to add new literary skills to the old three Rs of reading, writing, and arithmetic. He insists that the key literacy skill of the twenty-first century is the ability to learn, unlearn and relearn … . The process of unlearning in order to relearn demands a new concept of knowledge not as a thing but as a process, not as a noun but as a verb, not as a grade-point average or a test but as a continuum… . And it means always relying on others to help in a process that is almost impossible to accomplish on your own.

Cathy N. Davidson, *Now You See It: How Technology and Brain Science Will Transform Schools and Business for the 21st Century* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012)*,* 12.

a. Perhaps what we need to "unlearn" is the limiting terminology that defines education for so many.

b. Unlearning strikes me as the most challenging of these new literacy skills, and I wonder whether it's truly necessary.

c. Is unlearning a new skill? Isn't this something done every time we revisit old material?

d. Also, departments need to work together and talk to each other, collaborate, give students opportunities.

e. I don't disagree with this in principle. But I do bridle at the way this line of thought converges with the "flexibility" demanded by neoliberal capitalism. One thing I want to teach is how to resist those demands, not just how to accommodate them.

f. But for the last sentence (which focuses concretely on collaboration), this assertion is, to put it most kindly, overly abstract. What the hell does "unlearn" mean anyway?

g. This resembles the difference between learning and credentials. Right now students are rewarded in the short term for the latter.

h. I appreciate the emphasis on process and collaboration. A key concept is TRAINING. How do we "reprogram" ourselves? Do we "program" others?

i. I am curious about what this process of unlearning looks like acted out by students and faculty.

j. Process is important, but so is mastery of certain topics, skills, even ways of learning.

k. I'm a bit confused by the assumptions underlying this passage. Isn't the goal of asserting the value of a humanities education more than this? Critics of humanities are salivating…

l. So part humility and part openness to adaptation – a rhetorical skill as much as a cognitive one – this is achievable if not already in force.

m. I don't know, every major scholarly controversy is an invitation to unlearn.

n. "Unlearning" and "unschooling" is a necessity if one wants to provoke and promote discovery, freedom, and agency. The history of American schooling is something to be taken very seriously, to challenge one our own assumptions. See John Taylor Gatto.

o. Maybe it's more about a purposeful and directed unlearning?

p. Not a new idea. Happens in classrooms all the time.

   a. It may, but are we conscious of it? Can we created the conditions for it to happen more frequently and/or lastingly?

   b. "Learning already incorporates the ideas of unlearning and relearning, but perhaps it's helpful to spell it out.

   c. This has been the "key literary skill" since Plato.

q. My graduate training emphasized individual achievement over collaboration but my work does not.

r. Can unlearning be intentional? How is it done?

s. How do we break down existing barriers to encourage this focus?

4) Is it possible for a whole society to have attention blindness? I think it is. We seem to be absorbed right now in counting the equivalent of digital basketballs: fretting about multitasking, worrying over distraction, barking about all the things our kids don't know. We're missing the gorilla in the room. We are missing the significance of the information age that is standing in the midst of our lives, defiantly thumping her chest. It's not that we haven't noticed the change.

Actually, we're pretty obsessed with it. What we haven't done yet is rethink how we need to be organizing our institutions – our schools, our offices – to maximize the opportunities of our digital age.

Cathy N. Davidson, *Now You See It: How Technology and Brain Science Will Transform Schools and Business for the 21st Century* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012)*,* 12.

a. The gorilla in the room is hard to see, but very active. In my view, her key feature is a disruption of hierarchy and an opening of access to all kinds of knowledge.

b. Information is not knowledge; knowledge is not understanding; understanding is not wisdom. Thinking primarily of information age diverts attention from more important goals.

    i. How do we know when we know something?

c. How do digital tools assist in "knowledge"? Why is Google (properly used) considered inferior to the index or the bibliography?

d. Would be great to change institutions and policies to minimize certain distractions (i.e. overuse of email) so that we can (distractedly) pay attention to the constellation of things that matter.

e. If it is inevitable that we multitask now in ways not possible before, what are the healthier and less healthy ways of doing that? I mean not just intellectually, but emotionally, psychologically, even spiritually?

f. I wonder what it would look like to design university and classroom architecture radically differently in keeping with the new "ecosystem" instead of the old.

g. I have not decided what "maximizing the opportunities" means.

h. I agree [with Davidson]. Yet – simply "including" digital tools is not adequate. What can university education do to engage the new information age yet also provide resources to think (and exist) beyond it?

i. We have also left behind one of the <u>greatest</u> reasons for learning – <u>desire</u> to do so. Desire trumps all attempts at distraction. That should be at the heart of our institutions.

j. I love my digital devices, and they're very useful, but I do worry that the decline in my attention span isn't only due to age.

    i. Perhaps attention isn't declining, but our brains are changing => from linear patterns of reading to networked ones?

k. What is the gorilla? Is the gorilla that the ground HAS shifted or that we are failing to shift with it? How much of the shift is intentional? How can we unlearn the way we pay attention?

    i. I agree – what is the gorilla? Davidson's writing is irritating in this way; it reads like a motivational speech rather than an analysis. I agree that we must attend to what technology can do, but I'm leery of reconstructing our praxis in a way that turns us into cyborgs with mechanical prostheses.

l. We're doing that [organizing our institutions to maximize the opportunities of our digital age] right now!

m. Self-interest and self-regarding behavior are the hallmarks of academia ☹

n. It's evolving and changing. We adapt and it changes again.

    i. But the "information age" is protean and has been around (as Davidson admits) for a long time. I think it is dangerous to assume that we can stop, look around and see "it" – the best we can do is be ready to adapt.

5) The profession must make a strong case to the public at large and especially to prospective employers that our doctoral programs prepare students for career paths throughout society, not only in higher education.

Carlos J. Alonso, et al., *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature,* 12.

a. Why isn't an MBA or JD going to be better than a humanities PhD outside the academy?

b. So we're fully on board with the capitalist project?

c. Yes, but give them [PhD candidates] skills and opportunities.

d. Agreed – but how?

e. I think this is known already.

f. Data showing we've done this (or not) would be helpful.

g. GSAS needs to sponsor career fairs for grad students – and that includes inviting prospective employers, an outreach project that will take work but bring value.

h. Is this something the profession actually wants to do?

i. I would take the term "strong case" and replace it with "the profession must <u>sell</u> to the public" etc.

j. Should we be making an argument that we prepare people for many career paths, or should we focus on a smaller number we can really impact, like teaching.

k. AMEN. Those who work outside of academia are the most effective and knowledgeable ambassadors for those who work within. Reach out and include them in the discussion.

l. Not just working with employers – students should also engage public audiences during the PhD to show their job flexibility.

m. They [the profession] don't yet [make the case to the public], not 100%. Students need to have <u>validated opportunities</u> for non-course experiences, that count toward the degree!

n. Yes. But RISK – that the PhD education becomes viewed as subsidiary to job outcome and managed according to utilitarian goals and values.

o. Amen to that, but the "prospective employer" piece of this seems to get hardly any play in the discussions of this idea.

p. What if they [the profession] don't [prepare students for jobs outside academia]?

q. The key to actualizing this may lie in messaging that isn't unidirectional and instead taps into <u>real</u> partnering with prospective employers.

r. FURTHER QUESTION: Following this logic, does the concern for adapting the PhD program become simply a way of justifying the current jobs held by PhD-training faculty?

s. This seems right to me but quite challenging for faculties that have by and large passed their whole lives/careers in education.

t. What do employers and the public think when they see the letters PhD? How can we shape that?

u. But we also need to convince "employers" that we bring valuable things to the table.

6) In how many courses do students feel a sense of community, a sense of mentorship, a sense of collective investment, a sense that what is being created matters?

Randy Bass, "Disrupting Ourselves: The Problem of Learning in Higher Education," *EduCause Review*, March 21, 2012

a. How would I [as a teacher] know?

b. My guess is, more [students] than you may think – but if you ask how many teachers consciously try to create this, then I would say, very few.

c. A good question, and if we want to increase the proportion where they do [feel this way], then we need to increase our resources.

   i. Class size.

d. All to rarely – students are often approaching knowledge-building as a consumer exercise.

e. How can we create this feeling of "mattering"?

f. How is this determined? What do course evaluations ask that might reflect these "feelings"?

g. Less community is felt by students in interdisciplinary fields attending disciplinary courses.

h. The key in this quote is "collective investment" and, I would add, accomplishment and reward, beyond the individual but without excluding her.

i. In every class, some students feel this sense of community while others do not (this is reflected in evaluations). The challenge is to break that barrier, allowing students to find common group despite interests/abilities.

j. Are these things inevitably related – community, mentorship, investment, mattering? Which can exist without the others? When should we emphasize one more than others?

k. Depends on the material and how it's presented; on the student and how he or she receives it. In my experience, there is consistently – even on the graduate level – this connection to community and collective investment.

l. The importance of this depends on 1) the course level and 2) the course goals.

m. How many [elements] is sufficient? It will never be all.

n. I love this quote, and the responses. How long can community last? How long does it take to build?

o. A sense of community can be encouraged with joint/shared goals, or discouraged by competition.

p. Get rid of "silos."

q. Get away from the banking concept of education.

r. What about engaging in a service-learning project as a class?

s. The things on this list aren't all equivalent – community, mentorship, collective investment, and a sense that things matter. Emphasizing one might de-emphasize another.

t. Yes – perhaps one step towards creating this type of continuous community is to encourage students in this type of environment to form writing groups during the course that continue afterwards.

u. Community can be created in a given course/class – the question is – how can that community be fostered and <u>grown</u> from one discrete course to another?

7) By using the phrase "post-course era," I'm not saying that courses cannot be the site of effective teaching and learning. I will argue later how I think that can indeed be the case. On every campus there are committed and creative faculty whose courses are memorable and have impact for many students. What I am arguing is that we have reached the end of the era of assuming that the formal curriculum – composed of *bounded, self-contained courses*—is the primary place where the most significant learning takes place.

Randy Bass, "Disrupting Ourselves: The Problem of Learning in Higher Education," *EduCause Review*, March 21, 2012

a. I am not convinced that doctoral education has ever been best characterized by a "Formal curriculum" of "bounded self-contained courses."

b. This is perhaps true, just as the traditional monograph or academic paper may not necessarily be the most effective modes for transmitting high level scholarship. I say "may not" because I'm not convinced.

c. Learning experiences can (and probably should) be bounded without having to conform to many of the traditions/assumptions associated here with "course." The course can change.

d. I agree with this one strongly. I think we are <u>terrible</u> at thinking beyond the original course, and yet attached to the idea that students need X individual courses as their foundation before doing "independent research." Sometimes I think students would be better off in courses <u>during</u> exams and dissertations, and taking fewer of them overall.

e. The "course" becomes the organizational platform – requiring a team of stakeholders – and an investment in how the "course" functions in the learning trajectory of the <u>student.</u>

f. I don't find the "post" moniker helpful…it stands in contradistinction without really advancing anything innovative.

g. I doubt this. Precisely because it's an effective means of resource allocation, courses will remain central and significant. How courses are taught and relate to other courses may change.

h. I think Bass is thinking primarily about undergrads – to what extent is this true of PhD courses?

i. As with any humanities? The answer is "it depends." Effective teachers and learners employ multiple ways of engaging with material simultaneously.

j. I can't imagine we ever were in a place where the most significant learning took place primarily in such regimented conditions.

k. Linking courses together might also be helpful.

l. What is the role of "experiential" learning?

m. How to evaluate non-traditional informal "locations" of learning?

n. Launching creative projects (independent or group) within traditional course structures might be a way to coalesce the formal curriculum and high-impact learning.

o. In the context of Fordham then, maybe we need to start recognizing and identifying where else graduate student learning is taking place.

p. Until we develop coherent replacements, I have a hard time agreeing – in an institution as conservative as academia, eras can linger like hangovers.

q. I can't see a connection to my discipline here.

r. That "era" has never existed in liberal education!

s. Contributions to construction of a "course" become more collaborative, less focused on what faculty wish to teach, more on what students need to know.

5) Planning Theme "Mentor the Whole Person: Career-Wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships"

Wednesday, February 22, 2017

The meeting consisted of three parts. First, Dr. Jason Pedicone, President of the Paideia Institute for Humanistic Study, presented on the ongoing Legion Project, which tracks the careers of former graduate students in Classics. Second, representatives of Fordham's humanities departments discussed the career preparation they provide for their graduate students. Finally, participants divided into three groups to discuss our existing connections to alumni from Fordham's GSAS and to local organizations in the New York area to forge a strong network for humanities graduates to find fruitful careers.

Part I: Presentation by Dr. Jason Pedicone, President of the Paideia Institute for Humanistic Study

Pedicone realized while in graduate school that the job market was terrible, and that a tenure-track academic position was not a good fit for him. He started the Paideia Institute as a study-abroad program.

He sees it as a humanities start-up that shows the value of the humanities, as people are willing to spend money on the Institute's development.

Once the Institute was solvent, he started investing revenue in outreach projects like the Legion Project, which aims to solve the alt-ac "problem" for Classics PhDs.

About the Legion Project:

- Pedicone wanted to debunk the myth that humanities PhDs either become professors or end up living under a bridge.
- Universities refused to provide cohort lists to the Paideia Institute, as some students might not want to be contacted and the universities didn't want to reveal their rates of attrition. So Pedicone asked interns to use Google and LinkedIn to track all recipients of Classics PhDs at particular institutions, then email these individuals and ask for their stories.
- The MLA and the AHA focus on data to track PhD graduates, but the Legion Projet is more human – it includes a photo and a small bio for each person in the project and shows the professional success and applicability of a humanities PhD through their stories.
- People can also nominate legionnaires for the Project, including those who began a Classics PhD but did not complete it.
- The Project has now tracked everyone who's done a PhD in Classics [probably in the U.S.] since 1980, with an 87% success rate.

Through the Legion Project, Pedicone also found ways to make valuable connections. Eg. Matthew Levine, a financial writer with a Classics degree, is now on the board of the Paideia Institute.

The Legion Project also provided a lot of data:

- It tracks PhD output by program, and can debunk some statistics being spread by departments and give actual contours for the Classics discipline.
- It provides hard numbers for each university's placement rate, which has produced unexpected findings – some elite universities have low placement and some lower-ranked universities have great placement.

- Also shows what graduates do when they don't go into academia; for instance, 29% become K-12 teachers.
- Pedicone considered the ethics of making the information available to the public; it's important for students to know this material, but it could also be dangerous for the status of Classics programs, which are already under threat.

The Project is also encouraging legionnaires to develop relationships with one another: not just a data set, but also a growing community. Many members are angry at the situation in higher education.

This year, the Paideia Institute is bringing the Legion Project to the Society for Classical Studies annual meeting, bringing legionnaires for networking opportunities with students but also hosting a "re-training" event for Directors of Graduate Studies, which will discuss ways to address the issue of placement/career preparedness, show statistics, and also talk about successful outcomes for a Classics PhD

Part II: Fordham's Initiatives for Career Preparation, both Inside and Outside Academia

John Drummond, Robert Southwell, S.J. Distinguished Professor in the Humanities and Chair of the Philosophy Department:

Emphasized mentoring in the Philosophy department, with students taking three courses to encourage relationships with faculty mentors.

First Course: Introducing students to the department and the profession:

- Focus on department culture, how students can get involved
- Discussions of job prospects and how to create a dossier, starting at the beginning of the degree rather than only in preparation to enter the academic job market.
- How to start presenting at conferences and publishing

Second Course: Writing Workshop

- Informal, driven by students' concerns and questions.
- Taught by the Placement Director, focusing on many types of writing – the dissertation, teaching/research statements, job talks, articles, the dossier.

Third Course: Teaching Seminar:

- Prepares students to teach core courses in Philosophy.
- Also teaches how to work with different types of students, as well as the mechanics of teaching (eg. creating a good syllabus).

Job of the Placement Director was expanded under Prof. Nathan Ballantyne, who broadened the position to include non-academic placement.

- Teaches difference between a CV and a resume
- Highlights the transferability of skills to non-academic contexts
- This year, non-academic placement has been separated from academic placement.

- Panel discussions are now held for non-academic positions, with new initiatives in the works like a summer camp for high-school students that will be taught by PhD students to provide new teaching experience.
- Highlights range of careers students have gone to – publishing, IT (programming and web design).

Nathan Ballantyne on the Writing Seminar:

- We have to get students to rethink writing – have to take your readers very seriously, think of what your obligation is to them.
- Need to develop skills like writing a resubmission to an article or a cover letter to a journal.
- Create a community of writers, who can share their frustrations and questions.

Julie Kim, Acting Chair of the English Department and former Director of Placement and Professional Development

In the English Department, we're very aware of the limitations of the academic job market, but we're still committed to helping students get those academic positions.

According to a survey in 2014, 84% of Fordham English graduates are in academic teaching positions, with just over 50% in tenure-track jobs.

Resources for academic jobs:

- The Director of Placement and Professional Development's responsibility is for the academic job market. S/he works with students to edit their job market materials and maintains the job market handbook.
- Job Placement Committee assists the DPPD with the above responsibilities, and also provided students with a wider range of teaching experience, eg. at community college. Many students are now incorporating community college into their job searches, and these colleges require different materials and a different teaching style.

Resources for non-academic jobs:

- We have been encouraging students to consider positions at independent and private high schools. These schools are a fulfilling and available choice for PhD graduates, with opportunities to publish and to attend conferences.
- Planning to create a new community based on high school and alternative teaching experiences.
- Focus on "alt-teaching" jobs in community college and high school. English graduates are good at teaching and it's a skill they often carry to alternate careers.
- Eg. PhD graduate Julie Fifelski now works as an urban park ranger and noted in a recent survey that her pedagogical training helps her to explain things and really contributed to her interview process as good interpersonal experience.
- PhD graduate Melissa Whalen liked how the Peace Corps saw the value of her teaching experience.
- Teaching can also help graduates answer questions about the value of their PhD on the non-academic job market.
- Another key skill is writing and editing. Eg. Kevin Stevens now works as a Grants Manager.

- English department is also now encouraging students to pursue internships – they've created a new course called the Graduate Internship Seminar which will allow students to pursue these internships during the academic year.

Lenny Cassuto, Professor of English and Former Director of Placement and Professional Development:

- Has never been happy with the designation of "alt" careers – prefers the AHA term, "career diversity."
- "Alt" careers suggests that these careers are less likely, when actually the professoriate is the less likely career.
- Why not just shrink PhD cohorts to fit the job market? Turns the academy even more into a cloister – academics have to engage with the world outside. Not only does society support the university, but it is also a key part of the university's mission – to engage productively with society at large.
- So if PhD graduates enter the non-academic job market angry about being lied to about their job prospects, they're not fulfilling the mission of the university.
- Instead, universities should aim for a cohort size that allows for personal engagement with each student, helping all students to meet their individual goals.
- Departments should check in with students after two years in the PhD program to find out what their career goals are and ensure that the dissertation will fit this career path, and that the rest of their course of study is compatible.
- Can even consider graduate internships instead of teaching.
- Encourage faculty support of a range of careers – students should be able to discuss where they're looking with their advisors and know that these choices are approved.
- Eg. James Van Wyck highlighted how Lenny Cassuto (his dissertation advisor) supported him in seeking his GSAS internship, which empowered him to get new mentors, not just his dissertation advisor.

Patrick Hornbeck, Chair of the Theology Department and Former Placement Director:

- Theology has a natural alt-ac path: religious professional careers. The academic career is sometimes the path that's seen as "lesser than" – it's only in the last sixty or seventy years that religious scholarship has taken place primarily in secular institutions.
- In the last five years, non tenure-track jobs have become as likely as tenure-track jobs for theology PhD graduates in academic career paths. So the Theology department had to widen the lens of placement.
- The department looked at the last five years and noticed that Fordham students who take a postdoc often end up with a tenure-track job down the line.
- The department created a reading group around Lenny Cassuto's book, *The Graduate School Mess*.
- Agreed with Lenny that "alt-ac" as a term builds the idea that this path is second best to the academic path.
- Emphasized that we need to teach faculty to see non-academic jobs as equally as attractive, which could then trickle down to students entering the programs. We're now questioning the idea that a tenure-track job is normative.
- Addressing rates of attrition –

- o suggested having a hard conversation with students who are struggling to give options for leaving. Not just a punitive measure – asking if the PhD is the right path for the student and presenting alternatives.
  - o Looking at when things go wrong for students through student records, and the correlation between their success and their identity/life experiences.
- Suggested that placement officers get together and discuss techniques and resources (which is already happening in other departments; for instance, Nathan Ballantyne in Philosophy talked to John Bugg in English and has a copy of the English Department's Job Market Handbook).
- Discussed spreading the work for non-academic placement around the department – the burden can't fall only on the Placement Director; it should be shared among the department from day 1 of a PhD program. Faculty should plan at the end of the first semester to ask students to reflect on their potential career paths and refer to such career preparedness in performance assessments each year.
- Also looking at grants from institutions on theology outside Fordham. Eg. Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion will interview recent alumni about their training and then compile a report for the university to help improve.

Nicholas Paul, Associate Professor of History and Associate Chair for Graduate Studies:

- In terms of "compatible careers," History has a lot of work to do.
- Plans to tailor a survey for the department based on what other professors have discussed at the meeting to incorporate other trajectories than academia.
- Emphasis on creating an "outward-facing" portfolio during the coursework stage – eg. a website, a video.
- Leans heavily on Laura Morreale's work in Medieval Studies on compatible careers – panels with alumni about the process, the anxieties of a non-academic job search.
- Now focusing on networking and alumni, sending recent graduates to a network of graduates outside academia.

Laura Morreale, Associate Director of the Center for Medieval Studies:

- Excited that these discussions are happening; it means we are thinking of the value of a PhD graduate as a person in the world.
- Hosting the fifth "Compatible Careers" panel in April this year, with alumni from the Medieval Studies MA and others.
- Insights from previous panels: You just have to get that first job and demonstrate that graduate school skills can be applied in many ways.
- As an MA program, Medieval Studies gives students two years to decide what they'll do. It succeeds in getting students to stop and think before going into the PhD, turning this process into an informed decision based on career outcomes.

Dewis Shallcross, GSAS Director of Student Development and Special Events

- Highlights how the "Compatible Careers" panels (and the term itself) don't come at non-academic jobs from a deficit perspective – it's not setting up a dichotomy between tenure-track jobs and "other" careers, as all career paths are presented as equal.

6) Planning Theme "Incorporate Service and Community Engagement"

Wednesday, March 29, 2017

This meeting consisted of two parts. In the first part, Beth Torres, Grants Officer with the Office for Sponsored Programs, guided a discussion on the current status of the NEH and how project members could advocate for its survival. In the second part, guest speaker Dr. Matthew Frye Jacobson, William Robertson Coe Professor of American Studies and History and founder of the Public Humanities Institute at Yale University, presented to the group about the creation of the Public Humanities initiative at Yale and directions for public scholarship.

Part I: The Future of the NEH

Overview from Beth Torres:

- The NEH's funding only accounts for 0.06% of the federal budget.
- It has some Republican support.
- It's not just focused on the institutions for the humanities; it also supports a lot of small businesses and other institutions around these.
- The federal fiscal year ends in April, and there could be a possible government shutdown because of disagreements about the budget.
- To advocate for the NEH, it's better to call one's representative than to email or write a letter.

Lisa Lancia (LL): How can we advocate – is it better to do this as individuals, or as an institution?

Eva Badowska (EB): It fits with Fordham's Jesuit mission to support the NEH.

Laura Morreale (LM): So what can we do come April 28 [when the fiscal year ends] to show that humanities research matters?

Beth Torres (BT): Some Republicans are arguing that the amount of money allotted to the NEH is so small that we should be able to find the money to support humanities initiatives elsewhere – but it's very difficult to get grants anywhere.

Matthew McGowan (MM): How do we articulate what we do to the public at large to highlight its relevance and necessity?

LM: We seem to be taking the stance that the university is powerless, but this is not true.

Lisa Holsberg (LH): We should focus on symbolic capital: the NEH is powerful because it exists. It gives a stamp of approval so that private entities are encouraged to become involved. It's important to have this public mission for the humanities in the federal government.

Matthew Jacobson (MJ): Is this a society that values knowledge? It's a principle that has to be fought for.

BT: The National Humanities Alliance held a Humanities Advocacy Day on March 13th, so this has gone to Congress.

David Hamlin (DH): The NEH is not the only thing that's threatened – financial aid for students (Pell Grants) are also on the chopping block. How can this work with/against the fight for the NEH? Do Pell Grants have more value than the NEH?

BT: The NEH has wide value. When you apply for a grant from the NEH, you often have to consider how your project relates to the common good; for example, the NEH does programs for veterans in communities.

Samantha Sabalis (SS): Could we coordinate a statement on behalf of our project, looking at any examples created by the other 27 schools that received an NEH Next Generation PhD Planning Grant?

EB: I will reach out to the Council of Graduate Schools, who coordinates the twenty-eight schools who received the grants.

Part II: Matthew Jacobson on the Public Humanities at Yale University

Will narrate his own experience with the Public Humanities program since its inception ten years ago. It has lots of dimensions – civic, curricular, responsible mentoring…

The start of the Public Humanities initiative at Yale feels like a conspiracy—

- It emerged out of student agitation, with students wanting to change the terrain in American Studies.
- One student had worked with a public humanities program at Brown University, while another had worked in radio and wanted to incorporate something similar at Yale.
- They started thinking about what a public humanities program would look like, and made a proposal to Matthew Jacobson, who was then the Chair of American Studies.
- Steven Lubar from the Smithsonian came to consult with them.
- Focused on what they already had – found that students and faculty had already done several projects in the public humanities, such as civic projects, documentary film-making, outreach programs.
- Got thirty people interested in working with the initiative and adapting their courses, bringing the public humanities skills they already had into their teaching.

Funding model:

- Built a record of accomplishment and then incorporated this into small funding requests for modest amounts -- $10,000 or $20,000 at a time.
- Now the Initiative receives approximately $35,000 a year.
- No new faculty hired; focus on using existing resources.

After collecting these resources, the founders started to think about what this would look like as a program – a sort of "certificate," first only for American Studies students but now including students from many other departments.

They studied other programs to figure out what the program should look like, and came up with their structure:

- Four courses:
  - Introduction to the Public Humanities – readings on museum and documentary studies, analysis of what a public consists of. Ends with a collective project.

- o Methods seminar: Can take a class in oral histories, digital humanities, documentary studies…whatever fits into the student's goals. Can also be an independent study.
- o Practicum/internship: The students choose their own, with oral history projects, museum, film-makers…
- o A scholarly paper or exhibit. Eg. a project on Japanese-American internment, an exhibition on the centenary of WWI focused on diversity and patriotism.

Surprisingly, found that not many students were interested in receiving the certificate; some interested but couldn't devote that many courses to receiving it. Students tend to do projects and do one or two classes rather than taking the full certification.

Mission: to put university knowledge out to a public audience but also to bring non-academics into the conversation.

All scholarly work is creative, but we don't acknowledge how creative our work actually is. Public humanities work encourages this creativity but also emphasizes collaboration.

There's a siloing of different departments and institutions – the Public Humanities Initiative needed to create a rolodex to bring museums at Yale into academic conversations.

- Found that the different museums didn't really communicate with each other, either.
- Called a meeting of all museum personnel – forty people came, partially because they were suspicious and afraid that other departments would try to "own" museum studies. Instead, the Public Humanities Initiative wanted to create a portal to them.
- Also forged connections to art, drama, and music schools at Yale from School of Arts and Sciences.
- Created connections to major and small historical societies, local theatres, public libraries – forming a network to partner with.
- Trying to serve many different constituencies and place students.

Yale as the founder of the Northeastern Public Humanities Consortium. Lots of public humanities programs that get together twice a year and hold an annual symposium.

The level of student ambition and achievements was incredible – eg. a project on New Haven's food trucks that created oral histories of their owners and mapped the owners' perspectives of the city.

Sections of the Initiative:

- History and the Public – careful to separate it from Public History, making it more dynamic. Not just speaking to the community, but also for it.
- Space and Place – focusing on New Haven. Walking tours, mapping, bringing local relevance into the study of the humanities.
- Arts Research – archival artistic work in art, drama, music…
- Digital Humanities – partnering with the existing Digital Humanities lab at the Yale University Library.
- Museums and Collections
- Documentary Studies

Impact of the Public Humanities Initiative on the intellectual life of the university:

- On Jacobson himself: started working on historical work in a different register. Created the Crossroads of Hope and Despair, which combines photographs and interviews. Now works on documentaries as well.
- Laura Wexler (co-founder): created her own project after working with Public Humanities students that tracks FSA (Farm Security Administration) photographs in the 1930s by photographer and location, using digital tools. The Public Humanities Initiative showed her new ways to be a historian of photography.

Q&A Session:

MM: It's interesting that very few students opt for the certificate. I'm struck by the curriculum created specifically for Master's students going on to the PhD Could you talk more about this?

MJ: The four course requirement is too much for many students. They also fear the certificate will mark them as not going into the academy, and feel that it looks like they're giving up on the academic track. This is especially true of students in African-American Studies, where the Public Humanities feels like a luxury – they don't feel they can risk this experimental project.

We're considering the ramifications for the doctorate, possibly adding a Public Humanities dimension to the dissertation. We thought that the Public Humanities concentration in the Master's program would be popular, and were surprised when it wasn't.

Erin McKenna (EM): For the internship portion, does Yale provide students with funding?

MJ: Now there is summer money available for students, but they can also do an internship during the semester. We also support students by enrolling them in a class while they're on their internship.

EM: I noticed in the readings for today that public humanities projects disadvantage young faculty, especially faculty members of color. So is there another avenue for this program, for alt-ac jobs?

MJ: Yale's dean seems to want to prioritize the non-ac track, but it's not the only option. It sometimes leads to Public Humanities university faculty positions for graduates.

EB: We're building relationships with Fordham's press and radio station, but also with community organizations like the Bartow-Pell Mansion and Museum. How do you build these connections – what do you offer university and community partners?

MJ: One example is how we're creating "incubator" courses that are based on a theme coming up at the Smithsonian. On a local level, it comes down to relationships between people. There's an emphasis on serving all the parties involved.

LH: How do you encourage community involvement/a shared voice?

MJ: One way is by holding events off-campus. Eg. an event held at a local church green actually evolved to be all in Spanish by the end, taken over by community voices.

LH: Do you have ways to describe the value of this shift to community voices for Yale administrators?

MJ: We focus on the collective spirit changing, so dramatic in this instance because it involved a change in language. The shift to Spanish gave permission for a whole section of the community to step in who had been relying on translators before. It became a more important discussion than the one that was planned. Other people in the room are never going to forget that you're from Yale, which can be both a good and a bad thing.

SS: In terms of community, what happens to projects when students leave/graduate?

MJ: We put that in the category of responsibility – make sure that the end game is clear for all involved. We try to make sure it doesn't come down to a single individual, so the project can carry on once each student leaves.

DH: The program was build out of the American Studies program, and it seems biased towards American humanities/culture – is it possible to go beyond this?

MJ: It shouldn't be limited to Americanists; we also have to consider how it reaches out to global interests. Institutionally, the program would have to change, draw on other departments and faculty.

We could think more in terms of the skill set rather than the content, but it could drain the initiative of important energy. We could also redefine the local – for instance, a digital mapping project that tracked materials, labour, and capital flows for construction at Yale, which was both local and global.

LM: As you've laid groundwork with a focus on New Haven, you could bring other material to your platforms in the community, such as medieval subjects.

MJ: The focus on knowledge for its own sake ties in with the value of knowledge. Creates a shift away from the idea of the university as utilitarian, just a credential.

EB: Building on David Hamlin's question about bias towards American scholarship: it feels more like there's a bias towards cultural materialism. Is there room for the more theoretical fields, like philosophy?

MJ: I have to think about that…but one great Public Humanities project at Lehigh fits into this idea. The Southside project has excavated the footprint of Lehigh University, what working class areas were replaced with new buildings.

LH: I'm not hearing a focus on American, but on local – you could talk about theoretical ideas meeting the local community where they are.

MJ: You can bring the theoretical register into digital work.

Glenn Hendler (GH): Fordham would have an opportunity to be international through partnerships with global ramifications.

Patrick Hornbeck (PH): "localist" bias – eg. in the UK there would be a UK bias. It's about reaching out into the spaces around the institution. To answer Eva's question, in the modern world, philosophy and theology groups can reach out to religious communities.

EM: Mentioned a program bringing Latin instruction to schools nationwide. Also has a similar problem with the turnover of instructors (like the turnover of graduating students), so is cultivating fellow institutions to help make sure that a student will always be involved.

MJ: To add to that – so much of this work is about cutting a path that others can follow.

Elizabeth Cornell (EC): You've mentioned a few times that there's no director, so is there no guaranteed funding?

MJ: We have a promise every year and a cushion to draw on. Eg. for the consortium, Yale promised to fund years 1 and 4. We can also rely on the $35,000 from Yale to create programming.

EC: Does the status with no director influence the status of the program and of students wanting to take part?

MJ: We're mainly limited by the amount of time the organizers have, so we can't build on the initiative further, but that doesn't affect students' interest, like the Graduate Students Working Group.

DH: You focus not just on knowledge but on how you present it. How does this work with the assessment of different types of labour? In the same way, how do Public Humanities jobs fit into tenure decisions?

MJ: Public Humanities jobs still require stellar dissertations, so tenure is still based on writing. Eventually there will be a project that will make the leap for a dissertation or tenure, and it will probably be digital.

Key questions on how to assess alternative types of academic work – focus on the process rather than the product, as well as the knowledge produced and the student's takeaway.

GH: Mentioned the Imagining America Tenure Project (for which we had a reading), which addresses just this question – how do public projects fit into tenure deliberations.

John Drummond (JD): There are probably things that people could think about in terms of philosophy that would fit into the public humanities model described here – eg. food ethics with regard to food deserts, agriculture. More abstractly, students could talk about philosophies of ways of life. Also emphasized that it's so important to take these events off-campus, or community members won't attend.

7) Planning Theme "Cultivate and Curate a 'Living Humanities' PhD Model"
Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Prior to this meeting, the project participants divided into six groups based on key elements from the discussions at the previous planning theme meetings: holistic career preparation; internal coordination for external partnerships; holistic mentoring (faculty roles); pedagogy as method/object and digital learning; public scholarship; and admissions, recruitment, and retention. Each group compiled a two-page report summarizing their findings and proposing three recommendations for implementing this element into a new PhD model for the humanities (for these reports, see Appendix 7). The meeting began with presentations from each group about their findings followed by a Q&A. Finally, the discussion turned to next steps for the project: which elements should be highlighted in the White Paper.

Opening remarks from Matthew McGowan (MM) and Eva Badowska (EB):

MM:

- Focus on collaboration, both in what we've already done and what we're doing next.
- Key word: implementation – looking ahead to the application for the implementation grant.

EB: We received an extension on spending the grant money until September, as we still have $4000 left to spend. We have some ideas on what to spend the money on:

- A half-day bootcamp in June to plan the white paper
- A community-wide event in September with a panel to discuss what the grant has done in the last year.

EB: Fordham GSAS is engaged in strategic planning this year and is looking for recommendations – it would be perfect to tie in some of our recommendations from the grant. The implementation grant is due in November. Only three were given this year – to Delaware, Duke, and Chicago – so they're very competitive. We can use our remaining funding to extend the reach of our project.

The white paper will be due by June 30.

Presentations from the six groups:

Group I: Holistic Career Preparation

Lenny Cassuto (LC): the group focused on how to best effect cultural change. They focused on three threads: alumni, career services, and curriculum.

Dewis Shallcross (DS): career services has to communicate with departments and work with them.

LC: For curriculum – should there be a core curriculum for graduate school? Perhaps a course on the history of higher education. It would also be beneficial to have a professional development course that would allow students to mingle across departments.

EB: Would this be a credit-bearing course or an add-on? We have a tendency to add on requirements, but if this is essential, then it should be required, part of credit.

LC: Maybe it could be credit-bearing, but take place in the summer.

Magda Teter (MT): What about opening it up to members of the Consortium of universities, not just Fordham students?

John Drummond (JD): I have doubts about inserting the new role for graduate careers into Career Services – their culture is entrenched, hard to change and they need to focus so much on undergraduates. Why not place this role in GSAS?

LC: Louisville uses this model well (with a placement officer in the graduate school), but Michigan State runs it out of Career Services successfully.

JD: About the new course being proposed – in Philosophy we already have two seminars that are required but do not add to degree requirements. I'm worried about "adding on" as Eva says. Creating a summer course could bring up issues with money (eg. paying rent).

LC: We could put students in a dorm in the summer, which would allow them to meet each other.

Jeannine Pinto (JP): Could you expand a little more on the goals of the course?

LC: There are different plans for the goals – it's very important for grad students to understand the wider culture of graduate school in the US and how the world views what we're doing in academia. A key element is addressing audiences outside the academy. Perhaps we could bring in academics/other professionals to talk about what they do on a day to day basis.

EB: Is that plural or singular – are you talking about a career or careers?

David Hamlin (DH): Could be easier to implement a course in a department, rather than through GSAS.

LC: But having other departments involved allows students to meet peers across departments.

JD: A general view could be good, but if we do it in departments, we need to know that *all* other departments are doing it as well.

LC: We have to get away from hiding in our own departments – we have to take professional responsibility.

Group II: Internal Coordination for External Partnerships

MM: We were guided especially by the most recent meeting on service and community engagement. We discussed early on about what external partnerships mean. I was thinking about outreach, but other group members considered academic partnerships, eg. with the Bronx Zoo, Botanical Garden. They also considered partnerships in industry, through alumni networks but also through government and public institutions.

We came up with two concrete proposals – capitalize on what's already happening at Fordham, especially the undergraduate resources for service and consider how GSAS can become part of that culture. We also considered whether service should be a component of doctoral programs. The goal is to

have reciprocal benefits in partnerships. It raises the question of engaged scholarships, which Matthew Jacobson spoke on at the previous meeting. It also raises the question of what constitutes "proper" subjects of study and whether we have the means to assess non-traditional scholarship.

LC: There are already connections through Fordham staff – eg. the head of the New-York Historical Society used to head the humanities departments at Fordham Lincoln Center.

Francesca Parmeggiani (FP): We need to think about global partnerships, too. We want to bring in international experience, too, for creating our own model while also branching out.

MM: Francesca also highlighted in our meeting that we stand at a point of transition. We want to do what we can with our structures to nurture creativity, as change is coming.

FP: We have to think about content and how it's presented in individual departments but also how we do things internally.

III: Holistic Mentoring (Faculty Roles)

James Van Wyck (JVW): The main point was to complement the dyad at the heart of graduate education – the mentor/mentee relationship. We need to include professionalization courses that have academic and non-academic elements. The dissertation mentor has a lot of power – can change his or her students' goals, make them only want a tenure-track academic career. The apprentic relationship isn't enough – should be collaborative with other forms of mentorship.

There are three key recommendations in the report.

FP: What about creating a handbook for mentorship?

JVW: We considered that, but a two-page document is more likely to be read.

Melissa Labonte (ML): the document should list the key principles for mentorship.

Samantha Sabalis (SS): We can also point people to good resources that are already available elsewhere, instead of just creating them all ourselves.

JP: We need to make sure to include students who left the program when considering what makes good mentorship – did poor mentoring contribute to why they left their programs?

Group IV: Pedagogy as Method/Object, Digital Learning

Steve D'Agustino (SD): Approached the task by creating a Blackboard site and voice threads to interact with the content and with each other (but he was the only one to use it). Tried to organize thinking around specific recommendations. Sees digital learning as responding to a movement, how to adapt to this new dynamic environment. First have to think about what we're talking about when we say "digital learning." How do we identify good moments to use technology? We're aiming to make academic expertisemore accessible while also retaining its value. We have to think beyond boundaries, both how we learned in our educations and our institutional boundaries.

We have to learn how to recognize collaborative efforts, eg. making a database. We also need to recognize good collaborators. Eg. he is currently teaching a hybrid seminar, that only meets three times in the semester. His students love the university but don't understand why they have to go to class. They have a different perception of the university, see it as a totality rather than focusing on individual classes.

MM: I wonder whether the group discussed what innovations in digital media would look like? Eg. how could these adapt our requirements, especially in changing the dissertation.

SD: Concept of digital work is interesting. The dissertation is an end, but it doesn't show the process to get to that end. It leaves out all the learning and resources that went into creating that work.

Glenn Hendler (GH): projects like editions, translations, bibliographies are no longer valued as dissertations; some of these digital projects are ways to bring back these elements as dissertations (eg. databases). We're working on not adding to the dissertation, but making digital elements a key component.

FP: We don't need to reimagine the dissertation – we can look at existing possibilities and revise it. Eg. philological projects can go digital.

MT: We're not going to change what a dissertation is – if we change requirements at Fordham, it doesn't mean that a digital philological project will get a graduate a job at the end of the degree.

FP: But these changes are already happening – we need to be involved in them.

EB: It's becoming increasinly common to see dissertations with a digital component. Also twenty-eight universities have the NextGen Planning Grant, so Fordham is not the only one revising the dissertation.

SD: The dissertation is an active translation of information into a traditional form that has an increasingly small audience.

Nick Paul (NP): Key words here are "work" and "component" – component as a way to render one part of the dissertation as relatable to a wider audience.

Lisa Holsberg (LH): We didn't talk about the dissertation in our group, but we talked about cultural shifts. There's an emphasis on unlearning and relearning. Why not make the cross-departmental course a hybrid course, mostly online?

DH: A graduate from Fordham History just got a job in digital history with a very traditional dissertation but with very innovative pedagogy. Digital work is seen more as a need for teaching than for research.

JP: There's a move away from the dissertation outside the humanities, eg. with a collection of articles for different audiences instead.

JD: Some philosophy departments also do that, with three related articles being submitted as a dissertation.

Malkah Bressler (MB): Before coming up with these formats, we have to think about the skills one acquires only from this long project.

EB: Can see the dissertation expanding in two directions: collaboration/incorporating digital in the process but also a shift in dissemination. Sidonie Smith focused on how we communicate our work in *Manifesto for the Humanities*.

Group V: Public Scholarship

Samantha Sabalis (SS): Wanted to create opportunities for graduate students to engage in scholarship that addresses public audiences, as this is necessary for showing what graduate study does and representing the university to outside communities. But didn't want to just add on new requirements; need to look at dissertation, for example, to see if there are opportunities to revise existing requirements rather than add new ones. Also wanted to make public scholarship more attractive among faculty through incentives, so they in turn would make these projects more attractive to students. We also considered the danger of a "two-track" perception – public scholarship seen as less prestigious than a traditional project – and so decided to create a certificate that would make public scholarship an attractive addition to a degree. Also, we need to find ways to evaluate public scholarship for both students and faculty.

MT: Could label courses as having a public component that could build to the certificate.

Brendan Cahill (BC): How to break down institutional barriers early on? Could encourage students to cross outside their department; public scholarship as encouraging collaboration outside the department.

Fredric Nachbaur (FN): What about Digital Humanities Working Group? How well-publicized is that group?

Elizabeth Cornell (EC): Working Group is primarily faculty and staff, plus a separate graduate student group. The Working Group is unofficial, but George Hong (Chief Research Officer in the Office of Research) is excited about offering funding. He'd be agood resource for a Public Humanities Group.

A past initiative from the GSA was requiring everyone who received funding to present in a conference that was attended by all different departments and by alumni.

JP: As I've discussed before, I had to attend weekly lunches during my psychology PhD in which faculty first presented, then senior graduate students, then finally first year students. It was really instructive practice – we could implement that across departments.

Group VI: Recruitment, Admissions, Retention

ML: There are lots of synergies between our recommendations and those that have come before. Our discussion was motivated by the reading from Imagining America called "Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Community Engagement in Higher Education" (by Susan Sturm, et al.).

We highlighted the centrality of a faculty buy-in – success depends on faculty believing in the changes being proposed. We also need a shared understanding of diversity and inclusion (working with the new Chief Diversity Officer), and we need to align reform with faculty's responsibility to students and to their disciplines.

I want to focus on the synergies between our recommendations and what have come before.

- Our first recommendation of anti-racism training aligns with training for mentors.
- Our second recommendation on community engagagement can enhance recruitment but also help retention, connecting to a community outside Fordham.
- Focus on the dissertation: placing community engagement in the dissertation would require the involvement of the committee.
- We need to rethink the role of the GRE in admissions, as well as other criteria that can create bias.

Doug Steward (DS): I'm skeptical about masking undergraduate institutions in applications – one recommendation in the past for admissions to graduate school was prioritizing students from particular institutions, especially HBCUs.

Julie Kim (JK): We should look at bridge programs, eg. at Wisconsin-Madison – the student applies to both a Masters in African-American Studies and a PhD in English simultaneously and completes both in six years.

LC: In your recruitment models, the big issue is generating more applicants – we can use our location, but we also have to rethink our self-presentation of the "star scholar" as the only outcome.

EB: GSAS is currently addressing some issues through strategic planning. One data point we've found: our demographic make-up is far behind other similar institutions. So we've started a list of recommendations for attracting a more diverse student body from undergraduate to graduate programs.

Moving Forward to the White Paper

What are our key recommendations going ahead?

JP: I like the focus on public scholarship.

SS: I think a key recommendation is the two-page guide for mentorship, as re-envisioning mentoring ties into so many other parts, especially the relationship between dissertation mentors and mentees.

ML: Mentorship is also a very attractive element for students.

LC: Mentoring could be a good marketing niche for Fordham, with its focus on Cura Personalis. Recommendations based on revising admissions are also good, as no one is doing this well.

Elizabeth Butterworth (Elizabeth B): The recommendations for external partnerships and mentorship have strong synergies with each other.

ML: We come back to the critical role of alumni for career-wise counsel and mentorship. The students we cultivate well will become our alumni.

MT: Alumni in humanities are a valuable resource that's under-valued.

LH: Are we adding on to programs or making changes to essentials? A lot of burden is being placed on faculty. Eg. with mentorship: what are the systems of reward for retraining for faculty?

MT: We have to think also about what we'll give up of the old to introduce the new.

8) White Paper Writing Boot Camp

Monday, June 19, 2017

Opening remarks from Eva Badowska:

- Introducing plans – September event, planning for the implementation grant in Nov.
- Going through the agenda.

Starting with Section on What Worked and What Didn't:

Francesca: Why start with what didn't work? Seems better to start with what worked.

Steve: The focus of the response seems procedural, doesn't go into higher ed context. It was a strange year politically internally and externally, should we reflect on that.

Melissa: the guidelines ask us to focus on what was stellar and what could be changed in detail.

Steve: I'm thinking particularly about what you would do differently –

Eva: What insight are you thinking of here – additional pressure because of NEH funding?

Steve: I feel that somehow the conversation internally at the university was a component of the degradation of political discourse in society in general, and the way the election unfolded had an effect on our discussions about the humanities.

Eva: So are we talking about what worked or what didn't? Are we talking about forming a community in a time of great threat for humanities?

Steve: a happy side effect of these conversations is creating a structure for conversations across the university.

Melissa: the forming of a community happening in the context of a larger landscape – can add this idea in at the end of page three.

John Drummond: the reference can include the idea that the climate in which we are operating devalues the humanities and degrees in the humanities, when discourse has become antagonistic instead of cooperative, and yet we were able to form a community.

Nick Paul: Steve, I thought you were talking about the emphasis on logistical challenges at the beginning – I think that that's not necessarily what the guidelines are asking for.

Steve: Moving the challenges to the end would make these less important, from macro to micro.

Melissa: I think the logistical challenges are not insignificant – just getting everyone in the same room is important, and we had to change our formats because of these challenges. I tried to work backwards from what did work to think, how did we get it to work? Because we had some wrinkles at the outset.

Eva: My guess is that part of it is what the NEH wants is to create guidelines for the next generation of NextGen grants.

Eva: Steve, you also mentioned Fordham context in your response. How would you bring in the Fordham context in a helpful way?

Laura: There really are so many people at Fordham using their PhDs in ways that are not traditional, and I'm wondering if these people are being seen and heard. Along the way I did note absences of those people who have PhDs outside the traditional at our meetings.

Eva: This could definitely be included in our response

Sam: the meetings in the middle of the day could tie into this – people who work a regular work day off campus couldn't attend many of our meetings, which disadvantaged PhDs in jobs not in academia.

Francesca: we think of Fordham-centered or university-centered, but based on my perspective I felt the global element was missing – international students in graduate study can bring diversity, how can the PhD build on that population in a v. competitive market.

Eva: Maybe this links with the question of context – one of our contexts this year is the chance we'll lose international students in grad school in coming years because the climate is more and more unwelcoming. Also noticing that international universities have asked the questions about the PhD in general and in the humanities way ahead of us (especially in Europe – also in Canada). You raise v. practical/important questions.

Francesca: Something that's lacking but has the possibility for future development.

Steve: We focus a lot on utility (know X to do Y), but have to focus on the value of just knowing stuff.

Matt: Melissa, you mentioned on the top of p. 4, and I was wondering where you thought this reflection would go?

Melissa: The paragraph before the one at the top of p. 4, need to recognize that there's a bigger system in which this effort is taking place. Also the notion of engaging with that as part of a new PhD model will necessitate the types of (global) dialogues Francesca talked about. Belongs in both what worked and what didn't.

Dewis: In the survey responses (2e) – we talked a lot about diversity and we didn't ground the conversation in what's happening at Fordham. One of the reasons could be we only met twice at that meeting – it's a hard conversation to have with someone you've just met…there was a lot of discussion, too, and not a lot of outcomes.

Melissa: we can put it in what we wished we had known. Again, in terms of ways forward, there may be a way to re-emphasize it. We want to make sure there's a connective thread between the white paper and the implementation grant.

Eva: We have lots of ideas of things to change, but they're going in lots of directions. If I were doing this again, I would have wanted to start streamlining into possible models, finding the threads that worked best for Fordham earlier on to start implementing.

Elizabeth: I got the sense the grant was for getting ideas, not actually making change.

Eva: the grant is for planning. We heard about several other planning grants at the meeting in December, which were a lot more focused eg. one all about internships, or one all about the

dissertation. Zooming in on one component. We didn't do that, we had a holistic approach, which meant that everything is up for grabs,

Glenn: there's a danger of getting to the choice of what's more important too soon, but it's good to prioritize at some point, some specificity would be productive.

John Drummond: can address it in the "What Does it All Mean" section, can talk about this worry and the meaning that we get out of it is to think through our priorities.

Nick Paul: in the six papers, there wasn't competition. All had at least one achievable recommendation, and seemed to lead into each other.

Glenn: some convergence across the papers – eg. let's do something across the programs before the degree starts. Can combine some of these, practical things that lead to synthesis.

Eva: We seem to have morphed into section of "What it All Means"

John Drummond: One more suggestion – among the things that didn't work – it seems like the most important one is actually the third one listed. It also flows from the thing that worked (the great community), as it talks about what didn't work to create a fuller community.

Lisa Lancia: mentioned cross-over with CUSP.

Moving on to "What Does it All Mean?"

Eva: Glenn mentioned focus on prioritizing in this section, looking at the cross-currents in the six papers.

John Drummond: of the six groups, some could go across all the programs, while others can work only within certain depts. So in thinking about priorities, we could think of what works generally across the programs. I was thinking about 1, 3, and 6 for all depts (holistic careers, mentoring, and admissions). Public scholarship will probably depend a little more on people's sub-specialties.

Francesca: What about #4 – on pedagogy – can't that go across?

John D: but with holistic career prep, mentoring, and admissions you can establish guidelines across all programs, while for others you would have to tailor to particular disciplines. Digital learning can be a goal across depts., but how it would work out would change from discipline to discipline.

Melissa: So what you're saying is that some elements can carry across depts. while others would have to be tailored to each one.

Eva: these could be add ons – we already have mentoring and career prep, could add to that. Admissions is more procedural, but in all of these there's no revolutionary change.

Glenn: Why not look at each of the papers and pin down particular elements that could carry across disciplines?

Eva: Like pedagogy – covers the pedagogy of teaching grad students and grad students as teachers. In early meetings, I noticed in the minutes we talked about individual study plans but that didn't come back.

Francesca: One thing that I thought of is that the conversation revealed some tension between a static, traditional notion of the curriculum and demands internally and from the outside. The tension is static vs. motion, a v. fast developing world. Also thought about the pressure/commitment to assess internal resources, identify different stakeholders. We've been forced to consider the resources that we have.

Eva: How are you thinking about resources? Human? Commitment to change? How broad/narrow?

Francesca: Thinking about human resources, mentorship that goes beyond the specific field, faculty as resources, career resources. The main capital is the human capital.

Matthew: I'd like to second what Francesca is saying and add that this was a major concern in the "external partnerships" report. Looking at what they're asking us to do in "What Does this All Mean," they specifically mention external partners. We've laid sufficient groundwork for incorporating external partnerships into the curriculum.

Eva: I was also thinking is it a priority or not, but it depends on what priorities we get. John already said external partnerships was not a priority for him, I'm thinking of how much an impact would it have across the board and it could vary quite drastically.

Elizabeth: as well as priorities, think about "quick wins" to give us momentum?

Eva: why not look at the whole list keeping in mind impact across the board and quick wins, which have been suggested.

Melissa: a "Living Humanities" model should be iterative and dynamic, have to understand that as we change it we will reshape our thinking.

Eva: Another lens I'd apply is looking for initiatives that can serve as wedges, "Trojan horses" that have potential beyond themselves.

Dewis: what's the purpose of the newsletter – is it to show alumni what current students are doing, is it to show students what alumni are doing…also hard to get students to submit achievements.

Eva: We currently don't have a Development, Alumni, University Relations (DAUR) person. We need to hire a dedicated development person, and also need to hire an alumni relations person.

Dewis: current culture is that students abandon Fordham when they're done, so would be a major change.

Laura: key element for relations with alumni is personal relationships. Not that many alumni – you know who wants to be involved and who doesn't, so departments already reach out to people who are interested. People don't have an identification with the GSAS, they have an identification with their department.

Eva: GSAS should be a facilitator, which is where the alumni newsletter comes in. A big cultural change, especially with GSAS's relationship with DAUR.

Lisa Lancia: What I'm hearing is that it might be useful for GSAS to create a brand, but I think that the use of newsletters might not be as effective if they're passive. Is there a way to engage alumni, bring them back in a personal way, bring them back to mentor current students, have reception alongside graduation and then ask something of them.

Eva: Best feedback from alumni – they loved mingling with students at the awards ceremony this year, a great networking opportunity. Also Communitas – a previous initiative that people still talk about and want back.

Eva: What about the next rec – about Career Services' involvement in orientation.

Dewis: They're already on stage for GSAS orientation, but could also go to individual departments for orientation. Had a lot of conversation about usefulness of current staff, but have to use the staff we have and train them in what we need, so bringing them to orientation at depts. could help. The person hired to work with grad students and GSAS only saw 8 students last year.

John Drummond: Career Services should be brought into GSAS – it currently prioritizes undergrads and business.

Eva: Currently hiring a new director for Career Services, but graduate deans were not invited to interview that person, only undergrad deans.

John: We need someone in the grad school who can work on career placement, both academic and compatible. We have a hard time keeping track of graduates who go into non-ac careers, so would be good to have someone to track them.

Dewis: several models for this tracking from other schools that we could imitate.

Eva: What's transformative here? It's embarrassing that this is not already happening – alumni relationships, career prep.

Eva: what is holistic? Prep for academic and compatible, starts from day one.

Dewis: I also think that holistic involves using all elements of education and leveraging them for career prep.

Nick Paul: Holistic also means getting the student to think right from the beginning about how the structure is going to help them achieve their goals. Wondering if this all connects to 3 – mentoring. A lot of what we're saying about career services is being addressed already through the guide for mentors. Could also create a guide for Directors of Graduate Studies (DGS) that provide a sense of these opportunities. Handing over a packet to the new DGS.

Sam: What about the idea of holistic as across depts. – that really productive meeting where placement people from different depts. shared what they did, gave ideas of what's already being done in other depts.

Lisa: idea of helping each other by talking about particular skills in each discipline, helping to train a new career services person but also highlighting what your population needs.

Laura: holistic can also speak to a larger arc beyond Fordham, doesn't end with graduation.

Melissa: going back to Lenny's point that we're producing unhappy graduates – can we change the culture at a micro level for our students that we should have been doing all along.

Eva: unhappy people make bad alumni – there's a clear connection between this and the discretionary fund. The $20 cheques really matter. Rate of giving tells a story as well.

Eva: maybe we could reference what Melissa said – we want to create happy graduates, and there's a holistic element to that too.

Francesca: idea of holistic also leads to point c – the gen. ed course proposed in the humanities.

Eva: several variations proposed of a general course (a community learning experience?). Perhaps the insight here is that it's needed, but what it contains required further study.

John Drummond: I'm ambivalent about the idea of a doctoral common course. When will students take it? eg. philosophy students take three classes and the proseminar in the first semester, which is already an enormous load. Where would this course fit in? One suggestion was in the summer before the PhD starts, but will need extra money for financial aid to support students in that summer.

Laura: I never loved this idea because your time in graduate school is when you can fully immerse yourself in what interests you. This is a mechanism that's normal to us – teach a class on the problem. I don't think it solves the problem, as it adds in more work for faculty and grad students.

Glenn: there's an argument for it, but would have to get every dept to drop a required course, which is a big ask.

Melissa: what are the goals? Getting students to meet students from other depts., having a common learning experience of shared knowledge that applies across depts.,

Eva: the goals are vital – the networking, breaking silos, common learning. What I'm not seeing is a body of knowledge to be engaged. So maybe a course is not the way to do it. focus on commonality of experience and collaboration – can that be achieved through a joint research project?

Dewis: what about a week-long "boot camp" in the inter-session period, between Christmas and the start of the new semester.

John: a week isn't long enough to foster this kind of community across discipline. Can start from the bottom up – in the department, think about how disciplinary interests overlap. Not necessarily each dept all the time, but creating some connections.

Nick Paul: having it in the middle of the year means that the siloing will already have happened – should happen before the degree starts, to show them this community early on.

Elizabeth: would create a cohort beyond the department.

Melissa: could survey current students?

Laura: we have a body of people who have gone through the program before, could survey these people to find what they wish they could have had.

Nick Paul: could add in another level of mentorship, across depts.?

Dewis: what about an online space? Could break down mentorship dyad by building on student-to-student mentorship, perhaps in a social space online.

Steve: idea of perhaps five competencies students should have by the end of their first year.

Eva: let's go to 3b – the guide for mentors and mentees. The crafting of the guide seems very doable, could present it to grad council and workshop it. More concerned about how it requires culture change, because that's not a quick turn around.

Melissa: should have a statement of principles about mentoring. Is it too drastic to consider integrating this into forward hiring processes. Could be generalized so as not to constrain departments, give best practices.

John Drummond: what departments have guides for mentorship? Both philosophy and English have some guidelines in their handbooks. A lot of this work might already have been done – should get hold of docs already held by departments.

Eva: when we started GSAS Futures, Lenny gave a talk on mentoring, focusing on the student side about what students need to do to initiate good mentoring. Not just a statement on what faculty deliver, but also the ways it's a relationship of two, communication between them. Someone mentioned freshman advising as a guide, but maybe a good idea would be providing a learning opportunity for graduate mentors to share practices.

Nick: Can we talk about how there's the danger of community of faculty not accepting guidelines for mentorship. Eg. in history there are not guidelines for mentorship. Instead tried to create a pathway for grievances about mentorship, which went very badly.

Eva: if it comes from GSAS, feels like policy, can't change loyalties.

Melissa: perhaps DGS-led, let DGS of each department come up with a series of principles drawing on what's already done. A set of principles from which you can distill practice.

Eva: question is, why is moving forward on this mentorship document part of a model on the "Living Humanities" PhD? Haven't articulated that yet.

Sam: mentorship as a key component for making happier students. Also to make change need to have faculty support.

Melissa: thinking about one's own mentors to come up with good mentoring is problematic because it limits the skills to those of mentors in the past, dissertation mentors only. Encourages replication rather than innovation.

Eva: connects to two other areas – a more active, engaged approach to one's own learning and an awareness of international issues. Students from other cultures often don't know what the mentoring relationship should look like. Mentorship v. important for these students, have to think about them and how to prep them.

Moving on to bootcamps for Digital Humanities.

Elizabeth Cornell: want to tie this element to the element in external partnerships to look at existing partnerships – eg. make a partnership with IT at Fordham to create these digital humanities training.

Dewis: we attempted to do a training series and it didn't receive any interest. Have to think about demand for these as well as their usefulness.

Eva: A lot might change if we have that early experience with students across the disciplines in which people like Laura and Elizabeth talk about the skills they find the most useful, so students know what they really need to know to get the jobs they're interested in. Need to ground the training series in practical skills that students want.

Sam: I can look up the reference to the series of mini-courses with badges at the end offered by a university (from Mentor the Whole Person resources).

Melissa: the "GSAS seminar for science of teaching/learning" could fit with the new initiative of preparing future faculty (PFF) and with the Jesuit Pedagogy Seminar.

Eva: need to make sure our students are provided with technical skills on the job market. Feedback from students interviewing at community college and teaching institutions that we don't prepare students with enough technical skills for teaching.

Sam: could focus in a paragraph on the dissertation – being open to new projects, working on how to assess them, getting rid of bloat in current standards.

Eva: get everyone to think about their two main priorities.

Steve: focus on models of digital mentoring, digital humanities, digital teaching/learning. Also creating stronger networks for collaborating on public projects (5c).

Melissa: how we're going to adapt the dissertation to fit the new model, integrate public scholarship and external partnerships. Lot of overlap to put Fordham on the map for community engagement.

Dewis: integration of admissions with longterm support – to increase retention (aid, mentoring). Independent development plans – integrating mentorship, career prep.

Glenn: holistic – thinking of ways of connecting different parts of phd, eg with a portfolio, making pedagogy more central to PhD programs.

Doug: most interested in holistic career prep, which is taking place throughout, v. different from old models of grad education. Going beyond teaching, interests as more broadly applicable.

Elizabeth Cornell: how important it is to change the culture, how challenging it would be. make students know to be open to opportunity and failure, not expecting to leave the same way you came in. Use students who are in the first cohort to build the following cohort. Leverage resources.

Eva: holistic mentoring captures a lot of the holistic elements, creating development plans, training mentors and mentees for holistic career plans. Second one is pedagogy, so important but fell out in our discussions throughout the year.

Nick Paul: Shared experiences, following up throughout the year. Second, teaching and normalizing digital humanities.

Laura: Also focus on digital humanities – people to think digitally. Also focus on holistic career prep and highlight Fordham's successes.

Francesca: mentoring as fundamental, further reflection upon professional experiences in graduate school, what does an individual study plan mean. Career prep cuts across, but there is an urgency with that.

John Drummond: more individually based programs, thinking about how we deliver phds when we're in a time of shrinking programs. Also diversifying our admissions.

Appendix 6: Blog Posts

The following blog posts on the "Living Humanities" PhD project were published on the Fordham Graduate School of Arts and Sciences Outlook Blog after monthly meetings. Unless otherwise stated, the posts were written by Samantha Sabalis, the graduate assistant to the "Living Humanities" PhD project.

October 26, 2016: "Living Humanities" Ph.D. Grant Project Kicks Off at Fordham!

The inaugural meeting of "The 'Living Humanities' PhD for the 21st Century" project took place on Friday, October 14. The meeting started on a somewhat bleak note – the unhappiness of graduate students. In his introductory talk, featured speaker Leonard Cassuto highlighted that, in the current plan of graduate education in the humanities, professors teach graduate students to want something that their professors can't supply – the tenure-track academic position – so they're effectively teaching their students to be unhappy. Drawing on two chapters from his 2015 book, *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It*, "Admissions" and "Conclusion: In Search of an Ethic," Cassuto charted how we got to this point, giving a snapshot of graduate education and job placement since the 1950s. Most damningly, he suggested that current doctoral education is designed for people who could be the grandparents of our current students – the doctoral candidates who graduated during an academic job boom in the 1950s and 60s.

Having established this pressing need for change in doctoral education, the meeting then turned to how we can change, focusing on five key questions:

- How can we connect what we teach with what our students do with their degrees?
- How can we embrace the teaching mission of graduate study?
- Should the PhD be reconceived with skills-based approaches, and what would these skills be?
- What are the goals for the PhD degree, and what would it mean to reconceive doctoral education in the humanities as liberal education?
- How should the PhD go public?

Meeting participants engaged in a World Café format, discussing these questions in groups of five and taking copious notes to share with the group.

With these discussions, the tone of the meeting became a lot more uplifting, with participants discussing ways to make change and programs that had already started this process. Participants questioned what students get out of their degrees – how do we connect how we teach with what our students do with their degrees? What skills do students develop during the PhD? They also debated how to balance discipline-specific requirements with more universal skills – should graduate education be skills or content-driven (and is this an either/or question)? Are the disciplines dinosaurs? A common theme across the five topics that merits further exploration was what students actually do once they graduate from PhDs – are there recognizable categories of non-academic jobs that students go to? What options are available to humanities PhD graduates, and what do employers outside the academy value from a humanities doctoral education?

One key theme across the topics was the value of collaboration and interdisciplinarity. Many participants emphasized the value of collaborative assignments for students, but also encouraging students to look beyond their departments for resources and providing teaching opportunities that weren't just field-specific. They also highlighted current initiatives across the GSAS that help prepare graduate students for a range of positions, such as the proseminar for first-year students in Philosophy that provides professional orientation, or the Teaching Practicum in the English department that

prepares graduates to teach at a range of institutions. New initiatives were also mentioned, like the Preparing Future Faculty program at GSAS and a proposed Eloquentia Perfecta seminar in Public Communication for graduate students across the humanities.

Other resources from outside Fordham were also suggested. In a discussion of post-PhD careers, one participant suggested the "Humanities Unbound" project, which promotes careers beyond tenure-track academic jobs and investigates what alt-ac activities are already being pursued by graduate students and academics across the US (see this paper by Katarina Rogers from the University of Virginia for details). In a discussion of internship opportunities for PhD students, several people mentioned the MLA's Connected Academics Proseminar for alternate careers to academia, currently in its second year. In a discussion of taking scholarly research public, the "Knowledge Unlatched" portal was mentioned, which hosts Open Access publications that are proposed by publishers and then supported by libraries.

Throughout the meeting, participants highlighted avenues for improvement and expressed a strong desire to implement such changes. They also considered both potential gains and losses from the evolution of graduate education, and emphasized the need for humility in looking to new models. The practicality, enthusiasm, and wealth of suggestions from PhD students and graduates across disciplines and careers set a promising precedent for "The 'Living Humanities' PhD for the 21st Century" project's ongoing mission this year.

December 5, 2016: Opening the Gates: Ensuring Access and Inclusion During the Admission Process

On Tuesday, November 15th, "The 'Living Humanities' Ph.D. for the 21st Century" held its second meeting, focusing on the planning theme of "Ensure Access and Inclusion." For this meeting, the group was split into two parts, which will be addressed in two different blog posts. In this post, I focus on the first group's discussion on admissions, considering how GSAS programs in the humanities can attract and admit under-represented groups during the admissions process. A subsequent post will focus on the second group's discussion on retention, mentoring, and student support for under-represented groups once they are attending the GSAS programs in the humanities.

So what are these "under-represented groups" at Fordham? This term includes but is not limited to prospective and current students who are members of racial and ethnic minority communities, members of faiths other than Christianity, members of LGBTQ communities, and/or members of economically and academically disadvantaged communities. Meeting participants considered how these groups are not mutually exclusive and how diversity goes beyond racial differences, often including hidden identifiers that students may not be comfortable revealing.

So how can humanities programs in the GSAS attract members from these under-represented groups? The discussion focused on three elements: advertising the programs to create a more diverse applicant pool, rethinking how we evaluate applications to potentially create a more diverse student body, and above all considering the application process from the applicant's point of view. Group members suggested advertising Fordham's programs to promising applicants from under-represented groups by working more intensely with institutions in the neighborhoods around our campuses in the Bronx and Manhattan and using faculty contacts to forge links with institutions catering primarily to communities not well-represented at Fordham, such as historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs).

As well as reaching out to these communities, group members considered factors that could discourage promising students from applying to graduate school, such as the many costs that prospective students

face and the uncertain payoff of a Ph.D. degree in the current academic job market. Applying for a Ph.D. is an expensive proposition, including hefty fees to prepare for and take the GRE test, but even after students are accepted they must reach further into their pockets to pay for moving expenses and the deposit on a new home. To address initial expenses, the group suggested forgiving GRE fees for admitted students and providing advance funding for the transition to start graduate school.

Mitigating these costs still leaves the price of the degree itself. The cost of attending a Ph.D. program must be balanced with the rewards at its conclusion – if students do not want traditional academic jobs or feel that the market is too competitive, they see no point to even applying. To address these perceptions of limited or lackluster job prospects, the group proposed showcasing a wider range of career paths for Ph.D. graduates on the university website that could appeal to a broader group of applicants.

But encouraging promising students to apply is only half the battle; they must also be admitted into Fordham's programs. The group confronted current markers of privilege in evaluating graduate applications and how to acknowledge them. For instance, they noted that committees rely heavily on the GRE General test as a marker for student potential, but higher scores on this test have been linked with higher socio-economic status. As GRE scores are used for university ratings, the group found it impractical to get rid of the test entirely. Instead, they suggested training admissions committees about its limitations as a marker of academic potential to encourage them to take a more holistic view of each student's application. The group then considered looking at applications without any clues to the applicant's identity. One innovative suggestion focused on a technique called Blind Hiring, pioneered in Silicon Valley, which strips all identity markers from application materials and has resulted in more diverse and talented hires.

December 8, 2016: Helping Students to Navigate through Graduate School: Let's Talk About Mentorship

Entering graduate school can be a bewildering experience. As well as struggling with the demands of coursework and the expectations of professors, students must also learn the norms of their new environment. For some, this process is a necessary component of preparing for a doctoral degree. For others, it feels needlessly punitive and even like a form of hazing.

The question of how to welcome new students into the community of the graduate school and into individual departments was a central component of the meeting on Access and Inclusion, especially for the group focusing on student retention and support. The discussion in this group centered on one possibility for helping students acclimatize to the department – mentorships between students and faculty members. A productive mentorship can open a window into departmental culture and practices for students, as well as fostering the passion for the subject that prompted them to enter graduate school in the first place. Ideally, faculty mentors could not only provide valuable resources to their mentees and increase their confidence, but also develop a relationship with them that is goes beyond the requirements for the degree.

These ideal mentorships can be an asset for a department, but they depend on one key element: the mentor him or herself.

While many graduate students develop beneficial mentorships with faculty members, some are less lucky. Different faculty members can have different expectations and rules for their relationships with

students, which may be implicit, and students can also feel apprehensive approaching their mentors with their own expectations and issues. Stories of less-than-ideal relationships between faculty and students often circulate within departments, and students are subtly discouraged from pursuing relationships that could prove problematic.

Departments can help students create fruitful mentorships by encouraging them to develop relationships with several faculty members to evaluate them as possible mentors, but why should the burden of developing a mentorship fall entirely on the student? Drawing on their own experiences as current and former graduate students, meeting participants agreed that approaching faculty members can be a daunting task, especially for students who don't feel they fit into the culture of the department.

Instead, why not ask students what they expect from a mentorship, and provide guidelines for both mentees and mentors that draw on? Departments might also consider building other forms of mentorship that could help bring students into their community. For instance, students may feel more confident sharing their problems with peers who are further along in their studies. Departments can also introduce students to their culture and expectations through a foundational class, such as the Graduate Proseminar in Fordham's Philosophy department.

Mentorships can help students become happier and more confident members of the graduate school community. To reap these benefits, however, we have to consider the burden that we place on students to create strong relationships with mentors as well as the hidden expectations on both sides that can undermine these relationships.

December 9, 2016: What We Talk About When We Talk About Mentoring (a Reflection on the "Ensure Access and Inclusion" Meeting)

The following post is a response/reflection to the Third Meeting of NEH Project on The Living Humanities PhD in the 21st Century, "Ensure Access and Inclusion" by Dewis Shallcross, Director of Student Development at Fordham GSAS, and Dr. Steven D'Agustino, Director of Online Learning at Fordham University. For an overview of the meeting see the minutes here *or read through our overview posts* here *and* here.

As we reexamine the reality and the possibilities associated with the Humanities Ph.D., the relationship between mentor and mentee should be central to our considerations.
While it is generally accepted that mentoring is integral to the experience of graduate students, greater clarity about the purpose – or purposes – of mentoring is needed.
- Why is this relationship integral to the students, not just academically, but professionally and personally?
- What do we hope to accomplish as a result of mentoring?
- What are successful mentoring outcomes?

This seems obvious in the sense that institutionally successful mentoring culminates in the awarding of a degree. It is likely that many mentees share this perspective. But perhaps it is important to reexamine the various aspects of the student experience a successful mentor may affect. As we look at the humanities today it becomes obvious that the awarding a degree is not automatically equating to a tenure-track job, or even a satisfactory academic experience. A mentor is largely a guiding force toward the Ph.D., but a successful relationship and a lauded mentor often engage farther.
On November 15th, the "The 'Living Humanities' Ph.D. for the 21st Century" group tackled the theme of "access and inclusion"— a theme that we cannot untangle from the issue of mentoring, especially

considering retention and completion rates. If we look to diversify higher education at the doctoral level, it must also be our goal to strengthen existing mentoring processes and, if necessary, modify them to support our changing community and academic landscape. To do this, we need to examine the roles that mentors ideally fill.

If other outcomes beyond basic matriculation might also be considered components of successful mentoring, what should they be? Below is a potential list of mentoring components and associated outcomes:

- *Academic*– the mentoring relationship will support the mentee's advancement toward completion of the degree.
- *Disciplinary*– the mentoring relationship will support the mentee's increasing expertise in a specific discipline as evidenced by advancement through the curriculum as well as participation in discipline-specific events (conferences, conclaves, and webinars).
- *Social*– the mentoring relationship will support the mentee's increasing social integration as evidenced by participation in "extra-curricular" events and the development of a social network. As studies show students in graduate programs feel they lack "community" this aspect seems extremely vital.
- *Professional*– the mentoring relationship will support the mentee's progress in the development of a professional network as evidenced by attendance at recruiting events, a completed CV and the development of a professional network. Professional mentoring and support should not be limited to academic careers, and a successful mentor, if not able to advise on alternative professional outcomes should be able to advise the student where to find them.
- *Ethical* – the mentoring relationship will support the mentee's growing sense of the ethical implications of holding an advanced degree as evidenced by measures specific to a given discipline.
- *Cultural*– the mentoring relationship will support the mentee's understanding of the complex nature (values, practices, norms) of academia and of a particular discipline. This last outcome seems central, especially given the exclusionary history of the development of these cultural norms and practices. Outcome measures seem more elusive.

If we look at this list, it becomes increasingly clear that the mentor serves as a touch point for most aspects of the student experience and that without responsible mentorship students will flounder even more in the uncertain landscape of Higher Ed. We need to better understand how departments (and who in them) are filling these roles. So, how can we as an academic community and institution evaluate and access mentorship across disciplines?

Perhaps the development of a rubric might serve to help broaden how mentoring is evaluated and how a successful mentoring relationship at GSAS is not limited to achieving the degree. This is helpful for the purposes of reporting – it may behoove us to have many dimensions along which mentors and mentees can experience success. A rubric might help with the development of training protocols for mentors, evaluating the effectiveness of mentoring and providing clear expectations for mentees.

December 16, 2016: The Faulty Memory of Nostalgia

The December holiday season is steeped in nostalgia, whether we're singing about sleigh bells ringing and roasting chestnuts over an open fire or reflecting back on past years as we look ahead to a new one. We constantly reminisce about a past that probably did not happen quite as we remember it. This fond, if flawed, recollection of the past is a constant presence in academia, from looking back at the good old days (remember when all Ph.D. graduates could get professorial jobs?) to invoking academic tradition to discourage innovation (the dissertation has always looked like this; why change it?).

This inaccurate recollection of the past of academia and how it can hinder the transition to a new model of doctoral education were two of the main topics under discussion at the most recent meeting of the "'Living Humanities' PhD for the 21st Century" project. Entitled "Revitalize Learning Outcomes," this meeting featured guest speaker Sidonie Smith, Mary Fair Croushore Professor of the Humanities at the University of Michigan and the author of *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times* ([available open-access from University of Michigan Press](#)).

There are many exciting developments happening in higher education in this digital age. In her presentation, Smith discussed the use of new media for scholarly communication, shifting knowledge structures that focus as much on collaboration as on individual research, and a distributed university that has graduate students working not only with one or two faculty members at their own institutions, but also faculty and fellow students at institutions around the world.

But alongside these steps towards a more digital, collaborative model for higher education, there is also resistance to change. Smith explained how these changes could be misunderstood by faculty members, who sometimes perceive projects that use this new model as a Ph.D. "lite," as opposed to a Ph.D. based on the more traditional formats they are accustomed to – a single student writing a proto-monograph with the assistance of a select committee of faculty members. With their students' best interests in mind, some faculty advisors fear that making changes to the doctoral degree or dissertation can harm candidates' prospects on the academic job market, rendering them less able to compete with their peers. Addressing these concerns, Smith is very direct – if we stick to the twentieth-century model of graduate education, we are actually disadvantaging our students, as these normative standards do not assure academic excellence.

Not only are these so-called normative standards not a guarantee for excellence, but they have also not always been the norm for doctoral education. As I said, nostalgia can give a flawed perspective of the past that does not match the historical reality. For instance, one professor from English highlighted that the current gold standard for the dissertation in the field, a four-chapter proto-monograph, was not always the only option. Going back to the 1960s and 70s, he noted the accepted alternatives of the critical edition of a neglected text or the three-chapter dissertation. If dissertation structures have changed before, can they not do so again? In the same vein, another professor noted that our concept of the academic tradition is not as fixed as we would like to believe, but instead is made up of many subtle, continuous changes over time.

With so many avenues available for doctoral students and faculty in the humanities to create innovative projects and take research beyond the boundaries of the university, we need to take a hard look at the traditions that we cling to. So as we immerse ourselves in the holiday season and prepare to face 2017, let's try to set aside our nostalgia about the academia of yesteryear.

February 6, 2017: Transformation, Not Replication: Training the Next Generation of Doctoral Students

Is it possible to "unlearn" something? This was one of the main questions at the recent meeting of the "Living Humanities" Ph.D. for the 21st Century project, focusing on the planning theme "Inhabit the New Learning Ecosystem."

This term comes from Cathy Davidson's *Now You See It: How Technology and Brain Science Will Transform Schools and Business for the 21st Century,* in which she draws from Alvin Toffler to suggest

that "the key literacy skill of the twenty-first century is the ability to learn, unlearn, and relearn" (12). Some participants scoffed at this description, seeing it as old hat. Don't we do this in our classrooms every day? Isn't this a skill that dates back to Plato? But perhaps this idea bears repeating – in adapting doctoral programs to suit a twenty-first century learning ecosystem, we need to let go of old assumptions.

One of these assumptions is that every Ph.D. graduate will go into a tenure-track academic faculty position (or that every student enters a Ph.D aspiring to this career). Today's Ph.D graduates are grappling with a much larger job market. While many candidates still make the tenure-track professorship their primary goal, others focus more on so-called "alternative academic" careers (alt-ac) or careers outside the academy altogether in non-profits, museums, government, or business, among others.

A second assumption is that incoming doctoral students will learn and conduct their scholarship in the same ways that their professors did. The constantly evolving digital and informational landscape means that students have new avenues to acquire knowledge, from the internet to MOOCs, as well as new systems of learning. One professor noted that he finds it harder and harder to find cultural parallels with his students, and feels that he is forcing them to use his systems of learning rather than the ones they have grown up with.

So how can we adapt doctoral programs in the humanities to accommodate more career outcomes? One suggestion is to talk to Ph.D. graduates who have gone to other careers. In "Graduate Education Reconsidered," James Grossman and Emily Swafford of the American Historical Association (and members of the "Living Humanities" Ph.D. project) mention asking alumni from History Ph.D.s working outside the academy what they wished they had learned during their degrees. They found five areas to address that could easily benefit students going into academic careers as well: "communication beyond the scholarly and classroom modes, collaboration, quantitative literacy, intellectual self-confidence, and digital literacy/engagement."

Among these five areas, communication stands out. At the meeting, several participants emphasized the need for Ph.D. students to address different publics both inside and outside academia. They saw this skill not only as a way for students to advocate for themselves and highlight their skills to employers, but also as a means of promoting Ph.D. study in the humanities more generally. Ph.D. alumni working outside the academy could become strong ambassadors for their disciplines, communicating what they achieved in their degrees to a much broader audience.

Participants had many suggestions about incorporating more career outcomes into Ph.D. programs, but they were less certain about how to engage students who were accustomed to learning through primarily digital means. So how can doctoral programs adapt to engage these students? Some participants were skeptical about making big changes at a time when digital tools are changing so frequently. What if we adopt something that turns out to be a passing trend? How do we maintain our traditions and standards of excellence while also staying current?

The general consensus seemed to be that we have to be willing to change, to unlearn outdated methods and try new ones (even if they might not last). But participants also highlighted elements of doctoral education that still remain constant. The key skills of mastery and manipulation are still key to learning, even if they are being done differently in our digital age. Moreover, some of the functions of studying the humanities still stay the same. They can still tell us how we got to where we are today, creating a "living archive" that makes the past current, and they still offer self-knowledge to those who study them.

Through the process of unlearning, perhaps we can let go of old assumptions about what Ph.D. students want to do and how they want to learn to create doctoral programs that will best serve new generations of students. As the [MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature puts it in their 2014 report](#), we should encourage "a shift from a narrative of replication, in which students imitate their mentors, to one of transformation, since graduate programs should be centered on students' diverse learning and career development needs."

March 8, 2017: Every Ph.D. Needs an Exit Strategy

A soon-to-be English Ph.D. comes across a recent graduate studying in the stacks. One is finishing her dissertation and excited to be nearing the end of the process. The other? Well, the euphoria from the defense is dissipating. When you're adjuncting at the same university for less money than you made as a graduate student and you're diligently trying for job after job (in academia, in publishing, in writing…) with little to show for it, you can start to wonder: what can I do with a Ph.D.?

This little graduate school morality play may seem a little bleak, but the thing is, you can actually do a lot with a Ph.D. In ["Humanities Unbound,"](#) a survey of humanities Ph.D. graduates working in "alternative academic" positions, Katina Rogers found that respondents had gone on to find careers in the fields of academic administration, government, and journalism, or worked at institutions like cultural heritage organizations, libraries, or non-profits. And while we've all heard horror stories about needing to take the Ph.D. off a resume to be more hirable, in fact many employers value a Ph.D. in a job candidate. Several employers interviewed as part of the *[Pathways Through Graduate School](#)* study by the Educational Testing Service and the Council of Graduate Schools saw candidates with graduate degrees as having not only advanced knowledge, but also the ability to lead, design projects, and problem-solve in innovative ways.

So why do so many Ph.D.s struggle to find stable work upon graduation? Some certainly take positions as adjuncts to persevere with the dream of a tenure-track academic job (a separate issue, [recently devastatingly summed up by Kevin Birmingham](#)), but many others simply don't know what else to do. It's possible to leave a Ph.D. with a completed dissertation, a teaching portfolio, and selection of well-crafted cover letters for academic jobs, but with no resume, no contacts outside academia, and no idea of what jobs you're qualified for. It's also difficult for many Ph.D.s to articulate their many skills for employers beyond the content of their dissertation and teaching. For example, few non-academic employers will value my deep knowledge of fifteenth-century religious education and how to revise comma splices, but they could certainly appreciate my grant-writing techniques, my facility as a researcher, and my ability to set goals and work independently to reach them.

What every Ph.D. student needs to create, preferably before the frantic last lap of the dissertation process, is an exit strategy. This plan goes beyond writing a strong resume (though that's a great start). Students should be able to name a couple of career paths they'd like to pursue, and should have conducted research into the vocabulary and required skills for these fields. They should talk to Ph.D. alumni, explore internships, sit down with employees in potential careers, write for audiences outside academia…the list goes on. Basically, every student should start thinking about what he or she wants do after graduation long before finishing the Ph.D., even if the main goal is an elusive tenure-track job.

At the recent meeting of the "Living Humanities" Ph.D. project, faculty from different departments across the humanities shared their initiatives to help students prepare for careers after graduation. These insights highlighted several avenues for improving graduates' confidence on entering a non-academic job market. One suggestion involved expanding the role of the placement officer to include

non-academic careers. In the Philosophy department, a member of faculty now works on enhancing non-academic placement, while the placement officer focuses on academic appointments. In the English department, the placement officer is now assisted by a Job Placement Committee, who can provide students with a wider range of teaching experience.

Several departments are focusing on expanding their students' teaching skills. In Philosophy, there are plans to hold a summer camp for high schoolers, so Ph.D. students will have the opportunity to work in K-12 teaching. In English, the placement officer is working to prepare students for careers at community colleges, independent high schools and beyond. Discussions with alumni in the Peace Corps and the Park Service have highlighted the value of graduates' teaching experience, so focusing on this aspect of the Ph.D. could also help students answer questions about the value of their Ph.D. on the non-academic market.

Another key factor is not only normalizing non-academic jobs, but also raising their prestige among faculty members. Of course departments should still promote their graduates' achievements on the academic job market, but they should also highlight that a tenure-track academic job is not the norm; more students will find careers outside the category than within it. One goal in the Theology department is to teach faculty to see non-academic jobs as attractive, so that this perception could also trickle down to students and pervade departmental culture. Departments can easily contribute to the valuing of non-academic careers by promoting students' achievements from outside the academy as well as within it. Send out a congratulatory email with the list of students who received competitive internships. Post links to articles students have written for non-academic publications. Invite alumni in exciting careers back to the department to speak to current students about their jobs and how they got them. Students can then get ideas for what to look for, and will feel encouraged to take the initiative and search for opportunities.

Alumni in particular are an excellent resource, offering tangible proof of the many careers a Ph.D. can lead to. As well as showing how to market a Ph.D. for a variety of careers, alumni can also provide that oh-so-elusive quantity for many Ph.D. students – professional contacts outside academia. Many departments currently don't track their alumni working in careers outside academia, even as they meticulously list which graduates hold postdoctoral fellowships or academic positions. But Jason Pedicone from the Paideia Institute, a guest speaker at the last "Living Humanities" Ph.D. meeting, emphasizes the value of talking to alumni and showcasing their career paths. The Legion Project, a Paideia initiative that tracks students who pursued advanced degrees in Classics and publicizes their current careers, not only shows what can be done with an advanced education in Classics, but also helps create a community that Ph.D. students and graduates can tap into. Such projects can also be aspirational for students. For instance, the series of Compatible Careers seminars held by Fordham's Medieval Studies program, at which former Medieval Studies MAs discuss their current careers, not only provides insight into the range of jobs available to graduates but also shows students that getting such jobs is possible, and that their skills from graduate school have value outside the academy.

So if you're a graduate student, whether a starry-eyed first year or a world-weary dissertator, take some time to brainstorm what you'd like to do after graduation. Research how you could prepare yourself for this coveted career, be it with an internship, an informational interview, or a plan to publish in an online magazine. If you're a faculty member, think about reaching out to former dissertation mentees – are they all in academia, or have some found fulfilling careers elsewhere? As the soon-to-be Ph.D. at the start of this piece, I'm trying to follow my own advice – as I prepare myself for my defense, I'm also thinking about what I'll do next.

March 9, 2017: Channeling Our Creative Powers

Malkah Bressler is a Ph.D. candidate in English at Fordham University and a participant in the "Living Humanities" PhD in the 21st Century" Project. She participated in the MLA's 2015-2016 inaugural Connected Academics Proseminar. The following post is a reflection on the planning theme of the fifth meeting of the project, "Mentor the Whole Person: Career-Wise Counsel, Promising Partnerships. For a fuller overview of the meeting, see the companion post by Samantha Sabalis.

When I was writing my BA thesis, I told my advisor that I was considering a PhD in English Literature. Without missing a beat, Lisa said "well, you certainly have the creativity." It struck me as odd that my advisor valued creativity first before intellectual engagement and writing acumen. Creativity appeared to belong to the realm of creative writing and poetry and not to the analysis of books and poems. As I pursued my graduate education, however, both my MA and doctoral studies have revealed that Lisa is right; it is our uniqueness of thought and our ability to connect disparate texts and theories that attracts us to the academic life. As I write my dissertation, it is those moments when I "realize" something, when I make a connection, that fill me with a rush of joyful exuberance.

That "spark" of realization is, I think, the major impetus that propels us to dedicated six to ten years of our lives to the study of the humanities. The creativity we enjoy even extends to our teaching practice, crafting an argument, and creating elegant prose. Creativity is at the heart of everything we do except for one, very important factor of the graduate education: the inescapable job search. Why does our profession, at the moment when a student is deemed ready for the degree, contract and direct that student to the most expected and uncreative outcome?

Although it has never been the case that all people with PhDs assume a professorship, the narrative that doctoral candidates apply for and enter in to tenure track jobs has been ingrained into the collective psyche of the academy as well as that of non-academics. Anne Krook rightly observes that the more time a student has spent in graduate school, the more fixed this outcome appears. Isn't it strange? The more a student hones her ability to think creatively, the more she cleaves to a specific and expected path.

These days, we have realized that not every graduate student will or wants to become a professor, and we are developing methods to help graduate students find meaningful professions. Krook and many others have offered useful tasks that students, faculties, departments, and graduate schools can do to refocus their vision of post-graduate life. Suggestions include inviting those who have left academia to talk about their jobs, educating graduate students on the current state of the academic job market, offering graduate students the opportunity to conduct projects and internships that will build new skills, and of course, changing the mindset of students and faculty who are not wholly in favor of these new measures. As my colleague Samantha Sabalis mentions in her companion blog piece, several graduate departments at Fordham have already implemented programs and have created resources to help graduate students. At both the micro and the macro levels, there is a collective effort.

But I think we are missing the linchpin to this entire issue: although all of these fixes help, the only way to ensure lasting success is for us to constantly apply our creativity. As Katina Rogers argues "I think that the discipline of the humanities should be disentangled—or, unbound—from the rigid academic pathway leading to the single goal of the tenure track job." The "unboundedness" that Rogers identifies is an invitation for us to take our creative powers and use them to help graduate students discover various professions and the manifold ways in which a student can find meaningful employment.

Allow me to offer an example.

Not all graduate students want to teach; many value the doctoral education for the training in writing and researching. Obviously, these students need something different than exposure to non-academic teaching opportunities, but students are easily discouraged by not knowing how to begin. I think that this moment is an invitation to think creatively. A student might start by side-stepping the issue. For example, the student might ask herself "what topics do I enjoy researching?" When I asked myself this question, I realized that I enjoy writing about the connections between the environment and culture, and then I conducted a Google search for like-minded publications and organizations.

As I push further with this notion of creativity, I am reminded that Krook suggests that students write companion pieces to their dissertation chapters that are tailored for a non-academic audience. The goal is for students to demonstrate their ability to write in both academic and non-academic prose. But how do graduate students ensure that potential employers become aware of their abilities? Most graduate students know of the utility in maintaining a professional website that features teaching practices and dissertation updates. Why not add a section on non-academic writing?

Finding the advertisements for non-academic jobs seems painfully difficult, but the angst can be ameliorated when the student becomes imaginative. Of course networking with alumni promises the most success in terms of gaining a job, but before that, a student needs to know what to look for in a potential alumni interviewee. Recently, a friend mentioned interest in becoming an editor but was wary of publishing houses. As we considered what other organizations require editors, we both recalled a recent article in *The Atlantic* that was written by an employee of the Brookings Institution. It suddenly dawned upon us that organizations like the Brookings Institution, the World Bank, and the IMF employ in-house editors to review manuscripts that are later published in a variety of print and on-line publications.

Taking this creative thinking one step further, it dawned upon us how similar finding non-academic employment is to our research methodology. We begin our research by identifying a seminal scholarly text, and then we build our bibliographical arsenal by finding and reading texts that cite the initial work. We must approach the non-academic job search in a similar fashion. For example, once a student identifies a prospective employer, the student should review the biographies of employees, paying close attention to their past employment. From one website, the student will glean perhaps three or four others institutions to consider as well as an idea of whom to contact for an informational interview. We academics excel at these sorts of sleuthing exercises. It is how we find forgotten texts, it is how we find that one last article we need to read before we can finish writing, and it is how we find a dissertation or article topic that has yet to be explored.

We must unbind our creativity and let it thrive as we help students find their next career path. In doing so, we will ensure that the job search remains fluid and open, and we will avoid calcification. Embarking upon the search for non-academic professions is very much like that moment when we ask ourselves "what shall I research and write about next?" and feel a rush of excitement as we anticipate learning something new and writing something not yet said. If we keep our creativity close to mind, we will find the freedom to discover so many more opportunities and even, create new ones for our peers and students.

Appendix 7: Short Reports with Recommendations

Report on Holistic Career Preparation

On Wednesday May 10, we met to discuss "holistic career preparation" at Fordham's GSAS in light of discussions from GSAS's "Living Humanities" project. This report contains our recommendations in three general categories: (1) alumni outreach, (2) career services, and (3) a general education humanities course.

(1) We believe that holistic career preparation calls for *closer ties between GSAS graduate programs and alumni*. Programs must develop creative ways to allow the wisdom and rich experiences of PhDs first of all to be known to current students and faculty, who typically know too little of these outcomes. Such knowledge will introduce current students to diverse models of professional success while also openly recognizing the graduates themselves who have pursued a wide range of careers. The benefits of closer ties between programs and alumni are many. Alumni working in both academic and non-academic jobs can become models, professional contacts, and even mentors for current students. Alumni can offer advice to faculty members about the value of humanistic training for success in many of the career options open to humanities PhDs. Alumni are valued members of our community in whom we have already invested time and effort. We should therefore encourage their participation in Fordham's intellectual life whenever we can, thereby demonstrating to current students that their connection to their chosen discipline need not end if they do not chose employment within the professorate.

GSAS can encourage greater inclusion and visibility of alumni within the cultures of graduate programs in at least ways. First, *alumni panels*, at which alumni share their own professional stories, allow alumni, students, and faculty—all three groups are important— to engage in dialogue. Alumni panels may focus on many topics of relevance for students' professional development, including cultivating dissertation projects that open up the possibility of non-academic careers, writing for a range of audiences, teaching in high schools, developing transferable skills, and internships and professional credentials. In the past, some departments have hosted successful alumni panels (e.g., the Medieval Studies MA program), but future panels could benefit from centralized planning from GSAS. Ideally, departmental events should be widely publicized in order to promote attendance across disciplines, taking advantage of the common ground between humanistic fields. But opportunities for panel events featuring alumni from complementary disciplines (e.g., History and Medieval Studies) should be encouraged, too. In addition, faculty members ought to attend panel discussions, in part because by showing up, they endorse career diversity in an important and visible way: they recognize and endorse the value of humanistic education for their own students. They will also learn about the resources available to students, including access to our alumni network, enabling them to direct their students to make the most of these resources.

Second, GSAS should create an *alumni newsletter* to draw attention to the diverse work of our graduates and their contributions both inside and outside of the disciplines in which they trained.

Finally, the GSAS could make a standard amount of funding available to departments and graduate student groups to bring *alumni speakers* back to campus for "homecoming" events, allowing alumni to talk with graduate students about professional development topics, most specifically about how the skills they acquired at Fordham help them in their current vocations.

(2) Fordham's humanities graduate students appear to be underserved by Career Services. *We recommend that Career Services increase its outreach to and partnership with graduate programs.* Ideally, students and faculty members should both be aware of the guidance and support available in Career Services, and relevant staff in Career Services should be trained to better understand the challenges faced by PhD students seeking a broad spectrum of careers as well as the faculty members training them.

We envision a robust integration between Career Services and graduate programs. First, *Career Services should be represented at all graduate student orientation events—onstage, not in the audience*. This will ensure that students know, right from the start, what Career Services can do for them. A Career

Services representative with expertise in graduate student career-seeking should make regular visits to programs and GSAS events where career-related topics are discussed. Second, the GSAS should *hire such a Careers Officer*. This new role should be filled by a specialist with training in graduate career development in the humanities or with a significant amount of experience both within and outside of the academy. The Careers Officer position would involve advising students and faculty members about compatible careers and professional development. Ideally, a central part of this role would be to meet one-on-one with members of graduate programs (both students and faculty), linking them with people and resources inside and outside of the university, in efforts to build a community that is attuned to the idea of compatible careers. In a word, the Careers Officer would be a "connector." (Some of us thought the position should be filled by a PhD in order to ensure the Careers Officer brings credibility as an advisor to students and faculty—someone who has walked in their shoes, as it were. Others thought an MA could make a suitable Careers Officer, too.) Finally, we recommend the development of a *compatible careers training* for faculty members. It isn't enough to educate graduate students about compatible careers. The gospel of compatible careers must go forth to faculty members, too, so they can reevaluate their teaching and mentoring practices and revise departmental policies and curriculums to better serve the needs of students. We recognize how difficult it can be to get faculty members invest time in a training course, and perhaps GSAS could create incentives using both "sticks" and "carrots" to ensure compliance. The training course might be administered by the new Careers Officer.

(3) We recommend that GSAS explore the possibility of *creating a doctoral-level, general education course in the humanities*. The course would be thoroughly student-centered. Each iteration of the course would be co-led by faculty members from several programs. Students would take the course for credit and it might be a requirement for students intending to advance to PhD candidacy. The goal of the course would be to introduce graduate students to a set of issues common to all humanistic fields: (e.g.) compatible careers, writing in different voices, professional self-presentation, work habits, collaboration, and teaching. The course might also introduce students to the history of higher education (see Cassuto's *Graduate School Mess*, p. 209). The course would give students the ability to articulate the value of training in the humanities and to better recognize opportunities for humanistic engagement in their own communities. It would also be a launch pad for new collaborations among members of Fordham's graduate programs. In an age of fragmented, "siloed" scholarship and teaching, opportunities to talk across boundaries are as valuable as they are rare. The "Living Humanities" project has encouraged many cross-field conversations among its participants, and we believe the envisioned gen-ed course would extend the conversation.

The gen-ed course might be structured around weekly or bi-weekly lectures attended by all students, in addition to regular "break-out" sessions. The lectures would be arranged by a faculty committee and would represent an ecumenical range of themes and concerns. Given that faculty members will not themselves be well-placed to address all of the course's topics, or even recognize appropriate talent to call on, the new Careers Officer could play an instrumental role in helping to identify the right people, inside and outside Fordham, to deliver particular course lectures. Ideally, some lectures would be delivered by visitors to Fordham, including GSAS alumni; this would be especially helpful for introducing students to issues related to compatible and non-academic careers, including digital media, social media, and finance for non-profits. The break-out sessions would allow faculty members from each program to engage directly with their own program's students in conversation, and to connect the course issues to their program's special disciplinary concerns. Student projects might include interdisciplinary group projects, bringing together students from different programs and strengthening the community of graduate students across GSAS. The course would serve as a powerful "immersion" experience into a realistic and healthy framework for approaching graduate study in the humanities.

Report on Internal Coordination for External Partnerships

Among the recommendations from the reading and discussion at the November meeting on our first planning theme, "Ensure Access and Inclusion," is the intention to enrich Fordham's PhD programs in the humanities by cultivating relationships with underrepresented and underserved constituencies and creating a more diverse and dynamic community at GSAS and across the university. Clearly, a variety of external partnerships, especially local ones, could provide the basis for developing such relationships, and at our meeting last week Group II was keen to explore how getting PhD students (and professors) out beyond the walls of Fordham could enrich our programs in the humanities while also ensuring access and inclusion. From the outset we kept coming back to the idea of a "two-way street" (rather than, say, a "pipeline") with give *and* take as a necessary baseline for any partnership we would want to build. In our discussion, we drew notably on the readings from our most recent meeting in March on "Incorporating Service and Community Engagement," in particular Gregory Jay's article on the "Engaged Humanities," where he argues for the scholarly benefits of "service learning and engaged curriculum projects."[1] Our speaker at that March meeting, Matthew Jacobson of Yale's Public Humanities Institute, also advocated passionately for public scholarship and engaged learning and was encouraged to hear about Fordham's various service-learning projects at the undergraduate level and the longstanding leadership here of the Dorothy Day Center for Service and Justice.

Here, it seems, would be a good place for us to start with our "concrete recommendations," the first of which is:

> **1.** to capitalize on what is already happening at Fordham and to survey the "external partnerships" that currently exist across the university. Thus beyond the Dorothy Day Center, there seemed to be consensus in our group that the first step for any "internal coordination" should aim to collaborate with the undergraduate colleges, the Gabelli School of Business, the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, the Law School, alumni relations, WFUV, and Fordham University Press. Of course, this also includes what is already afoot in our PhD programs such as the service initiative in Classics (soon to be taken for credit), the internships being considered in English, and the stronger ties with alumni that all programs (esp. Medieval Studies) are trying to build. Our group took it as timely that the Office of University Mission and Ministry, under the leadership of Michael McCarthy, is conducting a thorough review of the University's many and various service projects.

There was some question here about what we meant by "external partnerships." It seems that MM and EB saw them as generally project-based engagement and outreach for the Humanities, whereas MB and FP had a more generous understanding that included partnerships with other academic institutions (e.g. NY Botanical Garden [Mertz Library's Humanities Institute], NYPL, MLA, Bronx Zoo) and non-traditional places for the Humanities such as "industry," public works, and government services. And yet, there was clear consensus that any external partnership did not have to be—in some sense could not be—*either* service-based *or* academic, *either* experiential *or* scholarly. Senior scholars like Jay and Jacobson and those affiliated with the Imagining America organization are adamant in their refusal to accept this "either/or" dichotomy when they commit to public scholarship and community engagement, and we wondered whether we should consider including some form of experiential

---

[1] Gregory Jay, "The Engaged Humanities: Principles and Practices for Public Scholarship and Teaching," in Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship 3.1 (2012). Jay writes, "service learning and engaged curriculum projects in the humanities have become a major avenue for public scholarship in the last ten years, helping to create collaborations in which university and community partners share in the design, execution, and analysis of intellectual projects that have real-life impact."

learning and public scholarship in Fordham's doctoral curricula in the Humanities. In fact, this is our second "concrete recommendation:"

> **2.** to consider adding an engaged-learning components to the curricula of our humanities PhD programs. There appeared to be general consensus in our group that engaged learning could benefit our students AND our external partners—*our two-way street* _again_!—but whether it should be mandatory is another question. What seems clear is that new media and advances in technology make public outreach more viable than in the past, and scholars like Sidonie Smith and Cathy Davidson (and Gregory Jay and Matthew Jacobson, too) have argued persuasively for incorporating new forms of scholarship into our graduate training in the humanities. A corollary consideration to this recommendation is thus how to assess new forms of scholarship like film, exhibitions, and public reflection on the humanities for a general audience within the existing structures of our PhD programs.

Public scholarship and community engagement bring with them certain challenges to the current structure of our PhD programs. For example, new kinds of final projects or non-conventional dissertations will require new modes of assessment to ensure that we continue to be able to bestow the PhD. In this connection, Francesca Parmeggiani was keen to note that we find ourselves in an unpredictable period of transition at present where the public scholar and the traditionally private academic are coming together; where the old-fashioned and the forward-looking are being brought into conflict; where barriers are being challenged and something new is emerging. In this sense what we are dealing with is a highly charged "creative moment," which we should do our best to nurture and cultivate. For it may determine not only our individual futures as academics and/or collaborative partners in an NEH grant at Fordham, but also the future of the humanities as such.

This is probably enough for now since there appear to be more than two concrete suggestions in the above. We also have five pages of notes that we have shared here and that may be useful in drafting our final white paper.

Report on Holistic Mentoring (Faculty Role)

The graduate advisor-advisee relationship is powerful, in part because of the centrality of this relationship to nearly all aspects of PhD training—particularly once a PhD student has completed coursework. Much of what gives the graduate mentor-mentee relationship its power is elusive, rooted in the affections of both advisors and advisees. Advisors often take their cues from habits encrusted with nostalgia, rather than from best practices rooted in research. And as Leonard Cassuto reminds us, advisees often take their cues—and have their affections shaped—by their advisors.

One thing is clear: the apprentice model alone cannot serve the needs of the 21st century humanities PhD. A living PhD model requires a more collaborative and responsive mentoring structure. Alongside the one-to-one advising and mentoring (relationships that will undoubtedly remain at the heart of PhD training) must come additional means of support and professionalization. The voice of the graduate advisor/mentor must be joined to others, and must learn to blend into a chorus. Given that TT jobs are only one possible outcome in a range of possibilities, and given that tenured professors are themselves not equipped to prepare students for the complete range of jobs open to PhD students and graduates, PhD programs need to cultivate multiple sources from which graduate students can receive guidance.

The need to augment the ways we mentor PhD students has everything to do with the kind of diverse professoriate we'd like to cultivate, just as it has to do with the range of careers PhDs end up pursuing. Further, the idea that mentoring is to be considered "holistic[ally]" requires us to face facts: PhD students—especially those in the humanities—are prone to depression. Here, it bears remembering, already-marginalized populations fare even worse.

One of our committee members remarked that "since we understand PhD programs as professional training programs, there needs to be an acknowledgement of and commitment to the professional outcomes. We are not simply training scholars, we are training individuals to realize personal and professional goals. To that end, programs need to formally incorporate professionalization programs. These professionalization programs should include as a matter of course both academic and non-academic elements." Our group agreed that it was heartening to see these types of programs/programming popping up on campus, but felt that this emphasis on multiple career paths needs to be the "expectation of GSAS for all programs," and that in order to make this expectation stick, resources should be devoted to encourage such programming. (For example, course reductions for faculty members who would serve as professionalization coordinators, or perhaps in re-imagined umbrella positions that would include coordinating Digital Humanities, Community Outreach, and internship opportunities.)

Another refrain—both in the literature about graduate advising, and in our group's communications—was the idea that advising PhD students is a demanding enterprise, for which there is little training. One participant suggested an informal seminar series on the model of the Arrupe Seminar might be desirable for junior faculty to alert them to expectations and demands on the instructor side. Another group member noted that mentoring is something that happens quite differently according to the different stages of a PhD program. Philosophy's proseminar introduces first-year PhD students to issues in the profession, the department, and the mores of the program. This enculturation is essential, particularly for first-generation or students from underrepresented population groups. Importantly, proseminars—at the outset of PhD training—must remain intentionally open to compatible careers. Participants discuss how particular aspects of the program—writing and the like—can be transformed if students are pursuing compatible careers.

One group member pointed out that other institutions—including the MLA, with its Connected Academics initiative—have done much of the heavy lifting with regards to compatible careers. It's up to us to take their findings and make them work within Fordham's specific contexts. Finally, at least three

group members shared that mentoring need not be a top-down relationship: peer-to-peer mentoring has proven effective in several programs.

Provisional Recommendations

GSAS—in consultation with each PhD program—should take following actions:

1. **Immediately begin to collect data and feedback** that will help programs diagnose Fordham's specific strengths and weaknesses in the area of advisor/advisee relationships. This data collection should include (but is not limited to):
   a. a survey of all current Fordham PhDs and PhD alumni, focusing on mentor-mentee relationships. (Patterned after, for example, this UC Berkely study.)
   b. Demographics
   c. Job outcomes
2. Drawing on the latest research on best practices in graduate mentoring and the survey results, **craft a stream-lined, two-page guide for mentors and mentees**. We recommend that this guide be crafted by a small committee comprising alumni of Fordham's doctoral programs, current doctoral students, and faculty members. The document should feature a mixture of generalized best practices—foundational expectations about the mentor-mentee relationship that hold true across programs—and program-specific norms.
3. Guide programs and individual mentors towards **reimagining the graduate mentor/mentee relationship, buttressing and expanding upon the dyad model by diversifying the types of guidance on offer**. Advising must be a collaborative process from the get-go. The 1/1 mentor-mentee relationship—with its attendant mix of continuous interaction and expertise—will remain the hallmark of graduate study. But graduate programs must ensure that graduate mentors/advisors cede aspects of their authority to a plurality of advisors, especially when it comes to compatible careers. In practice, this means that graduate programs need to begin to cultivate a roster of mentors beyond the department (beginning with a dedicated Career Services counselor for graduate students) and beyond the academy (by securing meaningful contacts, and encouraging internships and other professionalization opportunities beyond the university's gates).

Report on Digital Learning/Pedagogy as Method & Object/Collaboration

The group has been asked to consider how to shift the model of the humanities PhD so that it takes full stock of the ongoing transformation of the scholarly paradigm as it enters a digital teaching and learning ecosystem.

The current and historical model of both humanities scholarship and scholars is in many ways an industrial one – standardized, centrally controlled, and hierarchical. That model is increasingly perceived as outmoded as the society continues to deindustrialize, democratize, and accelerate. The emergence of alternative pathways to making scholarly work public, technologically-facilitated collaboration across time, space, and discipline and the gradual collapse of the gate-keeping function of various entities (journals, traditional universities, conferences) requires that the humanities develop new strategies to identify, develop, and sustain humanities scholars and their intellectual work.

Any emerging model must call PhD students, their faculty and administrations, their students, and the public outside academia to a constant consideration of the cognitive process of humanities education. Davidson (2012) describes how humanities scholars and students must develop the capacity, in Alvin Toffler's words, to "learn, unlearn and relearn" (p. 20)[2]. A constant, iterative approach to the work of humanities scholarship in all of its past, current, and emerging forms is required if the humanities are to retain their significance in a society increasingly enmeshed in the matrices of technology, utility, and commerce.

The group's topic thus falls into two distinct subcategories:

- How digital teaching and learning have already transformed our disciplines and scholarly methodologies, necessitating a greater emphasis on collaboration and interdisciplinary work, and
- How students and faculty require additional training in the capacities, technologies, and methods of digital teaching and learning in order to become full and effective participants in the ongoing transformations.

The recommendations below recognize these distinct needs: technological, attitudinal, and intellectual.

Recommendations

1. *Professional Development* - training opportunities for PhD candidates in effective teaching practices. Professional development might include:
   a. *Instructional Literacy* - enhance the ability to recognize, describe, and deploy various evidenced-based teaching methodologies.
   b. *Integrating Technology into Teaching and Learning* - heighten awareness of effective instructional technologies and providing successful models.
   c. *Collaborative and Participatory Teaching* Cultures- provide models/ opportunities of effective collaboration, developing capacities to implement participatory, student-centered approaches in teaching, to recognize "disciplinary competence and interdisciplinary synergies" in collaborative efforts, and to foster the ability for PhD students to "speak from positions of authority" in locations not limited to the front of

---

[2] See Cathy Davidson, Introduction. *Now You See It: How Technology and Brain Science Will Transform Schools and Business for the 21st Century* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012), 20. Davidson quotes Alvin Toffler, et al. *Rethinking the Future: Rethinking Business Principles, Competition, Control and Complexity, Leadership, Markets, and the World* (London: Nicholas Brearly, 1997).

the classroom, but from the back of the classroom as well, in roundtable, online, flipped, and other learning and teaching configurations.[3]

2. *Advocacy* - supporting graduate students as they develop into public thought leaders and scholars, with an eye to the emancipatory qualities/effects of humanities teaching and learning.
   a. *Social Media Literacy* - develop capacities to identify and leverage information and communication technologies to broaden the academic community's relevance and impact, creating space for sharing (among scholars) and leveraging tools for reaching out to audiences beyond the academy for showing intersections between fields of research and current concerns
   b. *Distributed University/Learning Ensemble* - establish broad academic/non-academic partnerships and enhance capacity to undertake team/collaborative projects in the humanities disciplines
   c. *Emerging Models of Scholarly Communication* - recognize and respond to the disruptions to historical hierarchies of knowledge caused by self-publishing, expanded access to information and the end of expertise. As Sidonie Smith pointed out, the question around scholarly research can be transformed from "What have you published?" to "How have you been communicating your work?[4] Digital ecologies present multimodal opportunities for scholarly communication distinctive from traditional book and journal publishing: inviting a conjunction of "deep, surface, distant, and affective readings" as well as interaction that can be simultaneous or asynchronous.[5]

3. *Communities of Inquiry* - design, implement, evaluate and refine rigorous democratic and reflective intellectual (and perhaps physical) spaces where faculty and graduate students across disciplines can come together to participate in sustained conversations of persistent/ significant targets of investigation.
   a. *Interpretive Acts* -
   b. *Digital Work* - foster the development of the environmental requirements needed for scholarship (the creation/ maintenance of databases for example).
   c. *Catalysts for Collaboration* - mindfully and deliberately create and sustain opportunities for collaboration across disciplines.
   d. *Tolerance for Creative Failure* - engage in a critical examination of how success is defined (in teaching, in colleagueship, in mentorship, in teaching, in graduate academic progress/performance) and make recommendations for revision.

Some concrete first steps in implementing these broad recommendations might include:

1. An instructional technology training series for graduate students, possibly including the introduction of Digital Humanities (DH) bootcamps before the beginning of the academic year.

---

[3] See Sidonie Smith, *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016), 99.

[4] Sidonie Smith, *Manifesto for the Humanities*, 55.

[5] Sidonie Smith, *Manifesto for the Humanities*, 62.

2. A GSAS-wide seminar on what is now often referred to as the science of teaching and learning (on what teachers can learn from the light that cognitive and brain sciences throw on the human learning capacity and process at various stages of life).
3. Systems of incentive and reward for undertaking collaborative research and publication projects that involve faculty and graduate students—and possibly scholars working outside the academy—in joint endeavors.
4. Explore and encourage (through incentive and reward) the replacement (where appropriate) of traditional capstone or long-term projects with new forms work that make the most of digital platforms, exhibition tools, and analytic programs.
5. Experimental pilot projects that investigate models of digital mentoring.

Report on Public Scholarship

Scholarship is a central component of academic life, and so needs to be at the heart of reforms for the new model for the humanities PhD. The traditional focus on the single-author, peer-reviewed journal article or monograph published by an academic press is currently being challenged, both by growing constraints on academic presses and by the rise of new modes of what Sidonie Smith calls "scholarly communication": digital forms like blogs, journals, and software; middle-state publications; and collaborative projects (Smith).

A particularly significant new goal for academic scholarship involves making it more accessible to public audiences. Daniel J. Cohen, Director of the Digital Public Library of America, highlights the "hidden cost" of the current, closed publication system in the humanities, which renders scholarship invisible to those without institutional library access, making potentially exciting and important work inaccessible to all but a few peers in the field (Cohen). As an alternative, scholars can disseminate their work through open-access scholarly publications, popular media, and an ever-evolving range of digital forms. Opening up scholarly work to public audiences can not only create new avenues for scholars to discuss their work more widely and intervene in public discussions, but it can also demystify academic life for these audiences, many of whom fund our institutions and/or constitute communities underrepresented in doctoral education.

However, public scholarship does not just require the wider dissemination of academic work. Instead, it should require rethinking scholarly conventions and engaging particular audiences outside the academy to ensure that this work actually reaches potentially interested groups. As such, public scholarship entails developing partnerships outside the university who will be involved and interested in the results. As Gregory Jay states, public scholarship requires "projects of collaborative knowledge creation involving teams of individuals and organizations from on and off-campus in quite complex partnerships" (Jay). Similarly, the authors of "Scholarship in Public" (a report on public scholarship and its relationship to promotion and tenure policies) emphasize the engagement of this kind of scholarship with "diverse publics and communities," as well as its contribution to the public good (Ellison and Eatman 6). Public scholarship should be collaborative: publicly engaged as well as publicly available.

In our discussion on how to incorporate public scholarship into the new model for the humanities PhD, the Working Group acknowledged several roadblocks. One general concern is how these projects are perceived and evaluated. Public projects are often seen as supplemental to, rather than an integral part of, academic scholarship. In "Scholarship in Public," the authors highlight how current academic reward and incentive systems exclude public scholarship (x). For faculty, public scholarship is ranked below traditional publications during promotion and tenure decisions, while for students, there is the danger that a publicly-engaged dissertation could be seen as less rigorous and less attractive on the academic job market than a more traditional format.

Within Fordham, this view of public projects as risky or less rigorous also holds true, as the perceived danger of deviating from traditional projects is one of the key barriers to pursuing them. For faculty and students alike, the limited availability of internal funding for scholarly projects could discourage interest in publicly-engaged work. For students, a dissertation with a public focus could be deemed insufficient by faculty mentors threatened by the shift away from standard formats. The discipline-specific structure of Fordham's humanities departments was also presented as a potential barrier, as public scholarship often thrives through interdisciplinary cooperation. In the same vein, the lack of contacts outside the academy for faculty and students alike could present problems, as these connections to public institutions and audiences form the basis for public scholarship.

The following recommendations for incorporating public scholarship into the new PhD model attempt to tackle some of these issues by making public projects more mainstream for doctoral students and faculty and by creating more avenues for scholars to pursue such projects.

First, we propose re-examining current dissertation practices to create space for public engagement while still maintaining the required academic rigor. Dissertation guidelines across humanities departments should first be examined to remove any particularly pedantic requirements and consider different models. Dissertation mentors should also be encouraged to require their mentees to reflect on how their project can contribute to the public good: what civic or community issues does this topic or field intervene in? Who is working on these issues, both in the discipline and outside it?

Second, we propose turning faculty into practitioners of, and advocates for, public scholarship. While it is not within our scope to completely transform the treatment of public scholarship in academia, we can gradually change our students' perception of it through their professors' involvement in publicly-engaged projects. We suggest incentivizing faculty to seek external grants for projects with a public focus, particularly when they request funds for graduate assistants (a practice that is already the norm in the sciences). Possible incentives include publicizing these projects and returning a higher percentage of indirect costs to awardees for grants that will fund public projects that involve graduate students.

Third, we propose creating stronger networks for creating and collaborating on public projects. We should enrich our existing partnerships with external institutions who can collaborate on public projects, as well as developing our relationships with Fordham's own units who do such work, such as the Institute of International Humanitarian Affairs, Fordham University Press, WFUV, and others. One possible avenue for developing these partnerships is to draw on the model of undergraduate resources for community outreach, such as the Dorothy Day Center for Service and Justice. We also suggest building a network of students and faculty at Fordham who are involved in publicly-engaged scholarly work to create a strong, interdisciplinary support network for students interested in pursuing public projects.

Fourth, we propose a Certificate in Public Scholarship that doctoral students can achieve during their progress towards the doctorate. One consideration in our discussion of a publicly-engaged dissertation was the possible perception of such a project as being less rigorous than the traditional model. With an optional certificate, a public focus becomes an additional credential to strive for, adding to the dissertation. For a model of such a certificate, we could look to the model created by the Simpson Center for the Humanities at the University of Washington.

Sources:

Cohen, Daniel J. "Open-Access Publishing and Scholarly Values (Part I)." *Hacking the Academy: New Approaches to Scholarship and Teaching from Digital Humanities*, University of Michigan Press, 2013.

Ellison, Julie and Timothy K. Eatman. "Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University." *Imagining America*, 2008.

Jay, Gregory. "The Engaged Humanities: Principles and Practices for Public Scholarship and Teaching." *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship* vol. 3, no. 1, 2012.

Smith, Sidonie. *Manifesto for the Humanities: Transforming Doctoral Education in Good Enough Times.* University of Michigan Press, 2015.

Report on "Full Participation" in Admissions, Recruitment, and Retention

Drawing on Sturm et. al.'s (2011: 3) concept of "full participation," which emphasizes "conceptualizing the intersections of student and faculty diversity, community engagement, and academic success as a nexus for the transformation of communities on and off campus," the examination and reform of recruitment, admissions, and retention are critical in cultivating and curating a "Living Humanities" PhD model that is both fit for purpose and the future. Indeed, recent scholarship (Cassuto 2015: 17-56; Posselt 2016: 20-45) demonstrates compellingly that prevailing assumptions and practices located at the heart of contemporary graduate school admissions processes are working against the "full participation" ethos. The drive toward quantification of quality and reification of agreement and compromise among reviewers throughout the admissions process, for example, impede efforts undertaken at other junctures of the applicant recruitment funnel to diversify candidate pools through effective recruitment. They also strip away valuable contexts that would otherwise strengthen "full participation" and instead perpetuate community self-reproduction and homophily at the expense of developing broader communities of inclusivity (Posselt 2016: 104-110). Only by reexamining and seeing beyond our certainties can "institutional mindfulness" emerge through "careful attention to decisions that accumulate to determine whether women and men of all races, identities, and backgrounds will have the opportunity to succeed and advance" in doctoral education (Sturm et. al. 2011: 5-6).

What might such an approach entail? Our recommendations are described briefly below. Throughout our Working Group deliberations, the centrality of faculty buy-in to reform in the area of admissions (and, by extension, recruitment, application, and retention) was repeatedly raised. Faculty members are lynchpin actors with norm-setting power and authority, but they are also not immune from incremental creeping in of bias at various aspects of the admissions cycle. Likewise, another takeaway was the importance of developing a shared vision of diversity and inclusion, one that extends beyond race to include factors such as socioeconomic status, gender, and sexual orientation. A related theme that emerged was the imperative of aligning all aspects of reform more closely to a broader understanding of faculty members' respective perceptions of their responsibilities to students as well as their disciplines, specifically in relation to "full participation." Finally, our Working Group agreed that all initiatives related to the goals of achieving, both in word and in deed, "full participation" across and within GSAS Humanities PhD programs should be coordinated carefully and deliberately with the University's Chief Diversity Officer, when that individual is appointed.

First, encourage information-sharing and collaboration among GSAS Humanities PhD programs to develop a sustainable model (either department-specific or joint) that re-conceptualizes recruitment to include planned outreach, monitoring, and assessment strategies to more diverse and non-traditional graduate student communities. Examples of initiatives currently underway include English's plan to engage Historically Black Colleges and Universities; and Theology's pilot project, funded by the Forum for Theological Exploration, to advance recruitment for diversity. Coupled with the development of new recruitment models, GSAS should organize diversity awareness training and anti-racism programming for all humanities PhD faculty members – which could be done either through events at which faculty are invited to participate/attend, or by having a qualified liaison or facilitator speak at humanities department faculty meetings during 2017-18.

Second, new recruitment models must be complemented by modified admissions policies and practices that ensure that advancements in the former are not undermined by the latter. Our Working Group identified the following priority areas for humanities PhD program admissions reform:
- Pilot the elimination of the GRE requirement in admissions decision-making, as research has shown that GRE scores are not a proxy for knowledge (the test is a measure of skills), nor are

they a strong predictor of academic or professional success.[6] In contrast, their use as a primary review metric contributes to the quantification of quality, which further disadvantages applicants from underrepresented groups.

- Enhance equity in the applicant review process by standardizing evaluation criteria and ensuring that criteria that are utilized do not inject unnecessary bias (e.g. undergraduate institutional affiliation).

- Explore the feasibility of establishing a bridge program or eased/fast-tracked admissions process for undergraduate applicants from underrepresented communities to select PhD programs (e.g. University of Wisconsin, Madison's Afro-American Bridge Program and the Fisk-Vanderbilt Masters-to-PhD Bridge Program) by first enrolling in a specified master's level program.

Third, strengthening retention to help foster "full participation" requires a rethinking of the nature and purpose of financial aid support; professional development; and effective mentoring. Leaving aside mentoring (which is being covered elsewhere), our Working Group recommends that GSAS:

- Make available advance financial aid to students (beyond or paired with a Steel Loan) to assist with the transition to moving and living in the greater metropolitan NYC area.

- Pilot the elimination of GRE scores from the Distinguished Fellowships review process (see rationale above).

- Establish dedicated resources to support professional development among underrepresented communities.

Fourth, "full participation" is impossible to achieve without community engagement informed by a clear sense of how Humanities PhD departments and their students can better work with community partners and create meaningful collaboration that is fully mainstreamed within doctoral education. We recommend:

- Undertake discussions with Mission Integration and Planning on future possibilities for incorporating service-learning into Humanities PhD curricula, with appropriate investment to establish sustainable collaborations that are monitored and evaluated regularly.

- Once the infrastructure is in place of committed partnerships and committed faculty, market this "public humanities" feature of Fordham doctoral education to prospective applicants.

- Raise awareness of the option for students to enroll in a tutorial course that focuses on experiential learning and research (e.g. a professional internship with an academic component built into the tutorial).

Lastly, our Working Group discussed how these reforms could impact the scope and nature of the dissertation. We agreed on two areas of promise in this regard. First, we support facilitating the incorporation of service-oriented or practice-based engagement into dissertation research. The results of this effort could then be disseminated back through the community at various times throughout a student's dissertation research and writing, including at the time of completion and successful defense. Second, we support a reexamination of the responsibilities and norms that guide dissertation review committees in their evaluation and assessment of innovative or interdisciplinary proposals. Such

---

[6] Fordham's Office of Institutional Research is currently analyzing the relationships among GRE scores, undergraduate GPA, undergraduate major, and undergraduate institution ranking, attrition and retention across GSAS Humanities PhD programs.

proposals should be treated with greater seriousness in order to reinforce many of the corollary reforms proposed here and across other Working Groups.

Sources

Cassuto, Leonard. 2015. *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Posselt, Julie R. 2016. *Inside Graduate Admissions: Merit, Diversity, and Faculty Gatekeeping* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Sturm, Susan, Timothy Eatman, John Saltmarch, and Adam Bush, "Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Community Engagement in Higher Education." 2011. *Imagining America.* Paper 17. Available at: http://surface.syr.edu/ia/17.